



Cornell University Library

BOUGHT WITH THE INCOME
FROM THE

SAGE ENDOWMENT FUND
THE GIFT OF

Henry W. Sage

1891

A.7.20.15

24.7.94

CORNELL UNIVERSITY LIBRARY



3 1924 102 766 098



Cornell University Library

The original of this book is in
the Cornell University Library.

There are no known copyright restrictions in
the United States on the use of the text.

A N
E X A M I N A T I O N
O F
Mr. Warburton's Account
O F T H E
Conduct of the Antient Legislators,
O F T H E
Double Doctrine of the Old Philosophers,
O F T H E
Theocracy of the Jews,
A N D O F
Sir Isaac Newton's Chronology.

By ARTHUR ASHLEY SYKES, D.D.

L O N D O N:

Printed for J. and P. KNAPTON, at the
Crown in Ludgate-Street.

M.DCC.XLIV.

E R R A T A.

PAGE 31. l. 19. for, *He*; read *Or he.*
L, 20. dele, *I say.*

Page 36. l. ult. for, θιδν καταφεύνσις; read,
θεῶν καταφεύνσις.

Page 39. l. pen. for *babetur*; read, *babes.*

Page 55. l. 1. for, *made*; read, *bad made.*

Page 239. l. 22. for, *was*; read *is.*

Page 263. l. 19. for, *bad*; read *bas.*

EXAMINATION

O F

Mr. WARBURTON'S, &c.

REVEREND SIR,

YOU desire so earnestly, and press so much to have my Sentiments about a late Book that has been much read, and more talked of, both in Town and Country, that I know not how to withstand your Importunity any longer. I send you therefore some of the Remarks which I made upon reading over *The Divine Legation of Moses*; enough, I hope, to satisfy your Curiosity, and to shew my Readiness to comply with your Requests.

You know very well our old Friend Mr. P***. He calls Mr. Warburton's Book a learned *Romance*; and he says with some Humour, that the Digressions in it about the *Mysteries*, the *Hieroglyphics*, the Book of *Job*, are, or may be deemed, so many

B

ingenious

ingenious *Newels*, which serve to relieve or divert the Reader. But then, he goes so far as to *doubt*, whether Mr. *Warburton* writes for *Utility* or for *Truth*. ‘ For he has told us so much, says he, about the Practices of those old Philosophers, and how much they were wont to *lie for the Publick Good*; that they taught one Thing, and believed another; that they made no Conscience of saying and teaching what they knew or thought to be false on the most important Subjects; and he declares himself to have come from the Schools of these Heathen Philosophers, that I cannot but think he may reasonably be suspected, at least for some time, till he has performed a *Quarantine*, to have received an *Infection* from them, and to have learnt to *lie for the Public Good*, as his Masters did before him.

‘ It is true, says our Friend, that Mr. *Warburton* does not think those Men to be *altogether free from Blame*; and it may be said in his Favour, that what he blames a *little* in them, he would not do himself: But yet his Censure of *them* is so very soft, and he is so tender of their moral Character, whilst he is so ready to flame

“ flame out against, and to shew no Mercy
 “ to others, who do not think as he does,
 “ that one cannot help imagining, that in
 “ his Opinion the good End they had in
 “ View did sanctify the Means they used,
 “ and that it was no great Fault in them to
 “ have *external and internal Doctrines*.

“ As to himself, he tells us, that he has
 “ been “ *in the CABINET COUNCIL of the*
 “ *old Lawgivers;*” that he is “ *lately come*
 “ *from the SCHOOLS of Heathen Philosophers*”.
 “ Vol. II. Pref. p. xiv. That as those
 “ Masters made a Distinction between Truth
 “ and Utility, and were famous for having
 “ an *Esoteric* and *Exoteric* Doctrine, so They
 “ were perpetually inculcating to the People
 “ what they did not believe themselves.
 “ May one not therefore very reasonably
 “ doubt, whether Mr. Warburton has not
 “ learnt in the Schools, which He professes
 “ to be *lately come from*, what They taught
 “ there? Whether any one, but a good
 “ Proficient, would be admitted into the *Cabi-*
 “ *net Council* of the Old Lawgivers? Whether
 “ He has not learnt their *Secrets*? Whether
 “ therefore what He publishes and inculcates
 “ to the People be not *Exoteric*? Whether

‘ it be not a Doctrine calculated only for
‘ the *Public Good?* And lastly, whether
‘ He believes it to be *True*; more than
‘ *Plato*, as he says, believed a future State
‘ of Rewards and Punishments?’

You will think perhaps, that This is pushed too far; and that our Friend should not have pressed this Topic so home. When I shew'd him, that Mr. *Warburton* had observed in his third Edition, that “ the Principles, which induced the antient Sages to deem it lawful to lie or deceive for the Public Good, had no Place in the Propagation of the *Jewish* and *Christian* Religion.” p. 336. ‘ Be it so, said he; do not mistake me. I design no more than this; That if Suspicions and Conjectures are to be admitted in Opposition to express Declarations, then it may as easily be shewn, that Mr. *Warburton* does not believe what He professes to demonstrate, as that *Plato* did not believe a future State of Rewards and Punishments?

If his Zeal for the Characters of the old Philosophers, whose Morality he so much admires, carried the good old Gentleman

too

too far, or made him express himself with too much Warmth, You must judge : I tell you the Fact. At another Conversation, He open'd himself very freely upon the Manner of Mr. Warburton's treating his Adversaries. " I stand amazed, said he, at the Advertisement lately published in the second Edition of the second Volume of Mr. Warburton's Book. It is so unbecoming, so little like what ought to be said by any Man of Letters, that it is not easy of late Years to match it. He hath, I know, the Examples of some of the most eminent Writers that ever Europe bred, to justify himself in his personal Abuses. And he seems to follow their Steps in erecting his Throne upon a Heap of Stones, as a great Scholar is said to have done before him, that he might have one always ready to throw at every Man that pass'd by him. He tells us himself of an antient Writer, " whose envious, rabid Temper, and perverse Fury of Mind, join'd to his perpetual Delight in Contradiction, gained him the great Title of Epitimæus, the Calumniator." This Man, says Mr. Warburton, was remark-

6 *The C o n d u c t of the . . .*

" able for a certain Mark of a *base* and
" *abject Mind*: He was as excessive in his
" FLATTERY, as in his *Calumny*". - To
this Remark, ¶ He adds a Reflection of
Polybius on him, --- " In censuring the
Faults of others, he puts on such an Air
of *Severity* and *Confidence*, as if himself
were exempt from Failings, and stood in
no need of Indulgence." Vol. I. p. 113

-- 14. Did the angry Writers of the last
Age, even the greatest of them, escape
themselves, when they took such Liber-
ties with others? Did they escape the se-
vere Lashes of Adversaries, who thought
they had a Right to return the Coin which
they had taken in the Republic of Letters?

It is hard to account for this evil Spirit
in some that would appear, and fain
would be treated as Great Scholars. Mr.
Tillard, who has the Character of a stu-
dious, honest, good Man, in a second
Treatise had owned himself to be the
Author of a Book, upon which Mr. *War-
burton* had very freely made his *Remarks*.
Upon this, Mr. *Warburton* publishes an
Advertisement in the second Edition of
this second Volume. --- " The Author of

the

“ the Pamphlet here examined hath lately
 “ made a public Confession of his *Author-*
ship, sign'd with his own Hand, and
 “ thereby *saved himself* from all further *Cor-*
rection of this kind. For He who *is so*
 “ *lost to Shame as a Writer* to own what he
 “ before wrote, and *so lost to Shame* as a
 “ *Man* to own what he hath now written,
 “ must needs be past all Amendment, the
 “ only View in Correction.”

‘ Mr. *Tillard* had been treated, as Mr.
 ‘ *Warburton* himself expresses it, *with very*
 ‘ *little Ceremony*, in his *Remarks*, because
 ‘ He had not *put his Name* to his first
 ‘ Piece. “ I had *put my Name*, says Mr.
 “ *Warburton*, to what I wrote, and he at-
 “ tacks me *without any*. Had either I con-
 “ cealed mine, or he *told his*, he might then
 “ have expected (if in other Respects he
 “ deserved it) what the usual Commerce
 “ of *Civility* demands between People upon
 “ equal Terms: But writing *without a*
 “ *Name* in the Manner he has done, is least
 “ of all excusable. For when a Man’s Per-
 “ son or Reputation is attack’d, I know
 “ little Difference between the *Ruffian*, and
 “ the *Writer, in the dark.*” Rem. p. 57.

‘ Thus is Mr. *Tillard* treated for writing
‘ without a Name. Upon this Mr. *Tillard*
‘ writes a second Book, owns the Former,
‘ and puts his Name in the Title as Mr.
‘ *Warburton* had done; and thus far they
‘ were now upon equal Terms. What now
“ is to be done? Why, Mr. *Tillard* is lost
“ to Shame, as a Writer, to own what he
“ had wrote before: And He is lost to
“ Shame, as a Man, to own what he has
“ now written.” Let us suppose, that Mr.
Tillard had told his Name at first: Mr.
Warburton’s Remark must have been,
that He was “lost to Shame as a Writer;”
‘ because now, when he has put his Name
‘ by publickly owning that first Book, He
‘ has this Imputation laid on him. How
‘ then might he have expected, or if he
‘ had expected would he have had, “What
“ the usual Commerce of Civility demands
“ between People upon equal Terms?” Or
‘ is it the usual Commerce of Civility thus
‘ to tell a Man He is “lost to Shame?” Mr.
‘ *Tillard*’s first Book was not thought be-
‘ neath Mr. *Warburton*’s Pains to write
‘ Remarks upon it. When the second
‘ appeared, it was with a Name? See now
‘ the

the Air with which this is treated. --- "I
 shall therefore, says Mr. Warburton, but
 do, what indeed (were it any more
 than repeating what he himself hath
 discovered to the Public) would be
 justly reckoned the *cruellest* of all
 Things, tell the Reader the Name of
 this MISERABLE, which we find to be
J. Tillard." 'Can you match this Piece
 of Civility? Rudeness, and Ill-Manners,
 and Incivility is bad in every Body; but
 worse in a Clergyman than in any other;
 and no Man whatever should put on such
 an Air of *Confidence* and *Severity*, but
 he that is sure that he is free from
 Failings;" and even such a Man, if he
 has a right Mind, will think that all
 Men stand in need of "Indulgence,"

I was with our old Friend Mr. P*** a
 third Time; and then he asked me, Whe-
 ther I had examined Mr. Warburton's Quo-
 tations with any Care. Upon my replying,
 that I had taken it for granted, that so
 learned a Man would certainly not impose
 on his Readers, at least not willingly, He
 bad me reach him Mr. Warburton's second
 Volume, and bring with me *Clemens Alex-*
andrinus.

You

‘ You may remember, said he, that to give an Account of the *Hieroglyphics*, he cites from *Clemens* a long Passage; and charges him with a Mistake, “ in making the *Epistolar*y Writing first in ORDER OF TIME, which was indeed the Last.” It is in p. 99-102. Now there is not in *Clemens* one Word, which signifies which was the *First*, or which was the *Last*, in ORDER OF TIME, of those several Ways of Writing which the *Egyptians* used. Which of them was invented *First*, or which was *Last*, must appear from something else, or it cannot be shewn at all. *Clemens* is here speaking, not of the Order of Invention, but of the Method of teaching others what had long enough been invented before: And he says, (a) *Those who are instructed by the Egyptians, first of all learn the Method of the Egyptian Letters, which is called Epistolar, or Epistographic: The second is the Hieratic, which the sacred Scribes use: The last and final is the Hieroglyphic.* This

(a) Αὐτίκα οἱ παῖς Αἰγυπτίοις παιδεύμενοι πρῶτον πάντων τὴν Αἰγυπτίων γραμμάτων μέθοδον ἐμανδάνεται, τὴν ἐπιστολογραφίην καλεμένην. δευτέραν δὲ τὴν ἱερατικὴν ἡ χρῶνται οἱ ἱερογράμματεis. ὑσάπου καὶ τελευταῖς τὰς λέρογλυψίκην. Clemens. Strom 5.

then

then was their Manner of Teaching; but as to the ORDER OF TIME in inventing these several Methods of conveying their Sentiments; there is not one Word Whence therefore is it, that Mr. Warburton could discover a Mistake in this Passage of Clemens? Mr. Warburton's Words are, upon citing this Place. --

"The first Mistake common to both [Porphyry and Clemens] and the natural Consequence of that false Principle is making the Epistolary Writing first in Order of TIME, which was indeed the last." But how does it appear from this Passage, that Clemens was under any Mistake, or even so much as thought of which was First or Last, as to Order of TIME in which these Methods were invented? Why, thus Mr. Warburton goes on,

"For that this was their Sentiment appears from Clemens's calling Hieroglyphic Writing, οὐστν κατευταιας the last and most perfect kind." Clemens is not in these Words speaking of the Hieroglyphics, as the last and most perfect kind of writing, but as the last and final or finish-

ing.

“*ing Thing taught those who came to be
instructed.*”

He mentioned several other Quotations (more than you would imagine) which appeared to me very much mistaken, or misapplied; and made me read the Book a second time. And since you desire the Remarks I made; I send you now what occur'd to me in reading Three or Four of his principal Heads: And I shall begin with what he has said on the Conduct of the antient Legislators.

The Point to be proved by Mr. Warburton is, That there is a certain Difference between *Moses* and *all* other Lawgivers. That *Moses* never inculcated the Doctrine of a future State of Rewards and Punishments; which yet is absolutely necessary to the Well-being of Society; and that *All* other Legislators did. Hence he undertakes to demonstrate the Divine Legation of *Moses* from his Omission of this Doctrine among the Jews.

It is very remarkable, that when Mr. Warburton first published his First Volume, he attempted to prove, that the Legislators of Old endeavoured to inculcate Religion, by

by making the Doctrine of a Providence in *its full Extent*, the grand *Sanction* of their Laws, with which their Systems of Institutes were *prefaced* and *introduced*: And his Argument indeed required, that it should be so, since if only a *present* Interposition of Providence was all that was inculcated by them, *Moses* and They would be at least upon the Par. He therefore insisted that the old Legislators urged a Providence *in its full Extent*, *i. e.* as it took in a *future State*, as well as the *present*, as the *grand Sanction* of their Laws. In his last Edition He has changed the Words, and very much the Sense of his Proposition, by laying down this as his Point to be proved.---The Legislators endeavour'd "to propagate Religion " by making the Doctrine of a Providence, " with which *in its full Extent* they pre- " faced and introduced their Laws, the " grand Sanction of their Institutions." In the first Edition, *a Providence in its full Extent* was the grand Sanction of their Laws: In the last,--- *a Providence* is the Sanction of their Institutions; and they only *prefaced and introduced* their Laws with it

14 *The C O N D U C T of the*
in its full Extent. . But neither the one,
nor the other, of the Propositions is true.

That some of the old Legislators introduced their Laws with a Profession of the Existence of Gods and Demons, and recommended a religious Observance of their Institutes, is true: But that they ALL so much as prefaced their Laws with the Doctrine of a Providence, either in its full Extent, or not; either as it takes in a future State of Rewards and Punishments or not, is so far from being true, that *some* of them never *introduced their Laws* with any Thing about a Providence; and even the Prefaces of the Three Legislators which Mr. Warburton cites, do not so much as mention a Providence *in its full Extent*. *Maximus Tyrius* has observed, as Mr. Warburton has cited him, that neither did *Solon*, nor the venerable Laws of *Draco*, take Notice of the Gods. This is charged with being an egregious Mistake in *Maximus Tyrius*; and a Law of *Draco's* concerning the Mode of worshipping the Gods is mentioned, p. 107. Allowing this, the Point to be proved was, that a *Providence was the SANCTION of Solon's or Draco's Laws*; or that

that their Laws were prefaced and introduced with it in its full Extent. That they might mention the Gods in their Laws, or provide for the Reverence or Worship of the Gods is one Thing; to make a *Providence* the *Sanction* of their Laws is quite another: it is still a different Thing to *preface* their Laws with a Providence in its *full Extent*.

When Mr. Warburton had mentioned *Zaleucus* as an Instance of one who had *introduced* his Laws with the Doctrine of a Providence in *its full Extent*, whether it was owing to accidental Forgetfulness of what he was to prove, or to real Want of Proof, or whatever else was the Reason, --- instead of producing clear and positive Evidence in Confirmation of his Point, He digresses for fourteen Pages together to prove against a very judicious and able Critic, that the Preface to *Zaleucus's* Laws was no Forgery. I enter not into that Dispute: Mr. Warburton's Business was to prove, what *Zaleucus* is quoted for, and not that it was no Forgery: He was to have shewn, that *Zaleucus* had made the Doctrine of a Providence the *Sanction* of his Laws, or had prefaced them with that Doctrine *in its full Extent*.

It is true, that if any Lawgiver thought proper to go to first Principles, or designed to teach his People the Foundations of good Morals, and upon them to build his civil Institutions : It was *useful* and much to the Purpose, to enter so deep into the Matter. And thus did *Cicero*, in Imitation of *Plato*; and thus did *Plato* in Imitation of *Zaleucus* and *Charondas*. They *prefaced* or *introduced* their Institutions with Directions how Men ought to regulate their Lives ; what an Advantage it was to themselves and to the Community to be *virtuous* ; and they told them how acceptable they would make themselves by this Behaviour to the Gods. But this is not making a Providence the *Sanc-*
tion of their Laws : Or if it be, I apprehend *Moses* has done as much as this : No nor is it *prefacing* their Institutions with the Doc-
trine of a Providence *in its full Extent.*

“ We are told indeed, that ALL the Le-
“ gislators of Old unanimously agreed in
“ propagating the Belief of a future State of
“ Rewards and Punishments: but that there
“ was this very singular Difference between
“ *Moses's Institution*, and all the other In-
“ stitutions of Mankind, that tho' he like
“ them

" them taught an over-ruling Providence,
" and a Religion, yet it was without the
" Doctrine of a future State of Rewards and
" Punishments." This is the Position in
the *Alliance of Church and State*. It can be
no difficult Matter, one would think, to
prove so plain a Point; if the Fact be true.
The Words of the several Legislators, or at
least of many of them, or some old Testi-
monies to such a Practice, may be produced
and compared with the Words of *Moses*; and
if it appears that they have inculcated a
future State of Rewards and Punishments;
either in their Laws, or in the Prefaces to
their Laws; more than *Moses* has done, the
Evidence will soon appear. But the Mis-
chief is, that Mr. *Warburton* has not pro-
duced one single Instance of any old Law-
giver, nor can he produce One, that has
made a Providence *in its full Extent*, either
the *Sanction* of his Laws, or has taught that
Doctrine in the *Preface* of his Laws.

Let us descend to Particulars.

Zaleucus's Laws had this Proemium; which, if I translate in many Places diffe-
rently from Mr. *Warburton*, I do it to ex-

pref the Original more nearly. (b) " All
 " the Inhabitants, whether of City or Coun-
 " try, should first of all be firmly persuaded
 " of the *Existence of the Gods*. -- These Gods
 " are to be worshipped and honoured as the
 " *Cause of all the real Good which we enjoy*,--
 " for which Reason every one that desires to
 " render himself *beloved by the Gods*, should,

(b) Τὰς κατοικήντας τὸν πόλιν καὶ τὴν χώραν πάντας
 πρῶτον πεπεῖσθαι χρὴ, καὶ νομίζειν θεοὺς εἶνας, — σέβεσθαι δὲ
 τέττας καὶ τιμᾶν, ὡς ἀπίστες ὄντας ἀπάνθων ἡμῖν ἀγαθῶν—
 Διὸ ἔκαστον δέ τοι εἰς δύναμιν ἀγαθῶν εἴης καὶ πράξεις καὶ
 προαιρέσεις τὸν μέλλοντα ἔσεσθαι θεοφιλῆν, καὶ πολίτην ἀμεί-
 νονα ὄνομαζειν τὸν τὴν ὄυσίαν προϊέμενον μᾶλλον τὴν καλοῦ
 καὶ δικαίου. "Οσοις δὲ μὴ ῥάδιον πρὸς τάῦτα τὴν ὄρμὴν
 πεπεῖσθαι, τὴν δὲ φυχὴν ἔχουσιν ἐγκίνητον πρὸς ἀδίκιαν,
 ὁδὸν ἡμῖν παρηγέλθω. Πᾶσι τοῖς τοιούτοις πολίταις καὶ
 πολίτισι καὶ συνόικοις μεμυῆσθαι θεῶν ὡς ὄντων, καὶ δικαίας
 ἐπιπεμπόντων τοῖς ἀδίκοις. καὶ τίθεσθαι πρὸς ὄμρατων τὸν
 καιρὸν τῷ οὐρανῷ, ἐκ τοῦ γίνεται τὸ τέλος ἔκαστος τῆς απαλλαγῆς
 τοῦ ζῆν. πᾶσι γάρ ἐμπίπτει μεταμέλεια τοῖς μέλλοντοις
 τελευτῶν, μέρμηνένδις ὧν ἀδίκησασιν, καὶ ὄρμὴ τῆς βύλεσθαι
 πάντα πεπράχθαι δικαίως ἀστοῖς. Διὸ δέ τοι εἴκαστον παρεῖ-
 ἔκαστον προεῖπον μὲν συνοικεῖν τὸν καιρὸν τῷ οὐρανῷ ὡς δὴ πα-
 γῶντα: γάρ γαρ ἂν μάλιστα τὴν καλοῦ καὶ δικαίου φροντίσειν.
 Εὖ δέ παραστῆ δαιμονιν κακὸς τρέπων πρὸς ἀδίκιαν, δια-
 τείβειν πρὸς ναοῖς καὶ βωμοῖς καὶ τεμένεσι, φεύγοντα τὴν
 ἀδίκιαν, ὡς δέσποιναν ἀσεβεστην. καὶ χαλεπώλαττην, ἵκε-
 τένουσα τὰς Θεὰς συναπολέπτειν ἀστοῖς. οἵνας δὲ καὶ πρὸς
 ἀνδρας δόξαν ἔχοντας ἐπ' ἀνδραγαθίᾳ ἀκροσόμενος πεεὶ
 ἐνδαιμονος βίοις, καὶ κακῶν ἀνδρῶν τιμωρίης ἵνα ἀπολέπτῃ
 τῶν ἀδίκων ἔργων, δεστιδαιμονῶν δαιμονας ἀλάσορας.
 Πάντας δέ τιμῶν ΤΟΥΣ ** οἱ κατοικήντες τὸν πόλιν, καὶ
 τοῖς ἀλλοῖς νομίμοις τοῖς πατέροις τὰς θεὰς. — Πόλιν δέ
 φιλαιτέραν μηδεὶς ἀλλον ποιείσθω τῆς ἀυτῆς πατεῖδος, ὡς
 θεῶν πατρῶν νεμεσώντων.

Stob. Serm. 42.

I think this mutilous Place should be filled up with some
 such Word as θυσίας, and read thus,— Πάντας δέ τιμῶν
 τὰς θυσίας, κ. τ. λ.

" to the best of his Power, be good both in
" Practice and Principle, and to esteem
" him a better Citizen who parts with his
" Substance than with what is right
" and just. But as for those, whose Appen-
" tites are so violent, as not to be persuaded
" to these Things, but have a Mind easily
" moved to Evil [or Injustice] we com-
" mand thus: That all such Citizens, Men
" and Women, and all Sojourners; should
" *keep in their Thoughts* the Gods; as *ex-*
" *isting*, and *sending Punishments upon the*
" *Unjust*; and should set before their Eyes
" that Time, when an *End of Life* shall
" happen to every one. For Repentance
" [or Remorse] happens to all that are
" about to die, who remember what they
" have done *unjustly*; and they have a
" strong Desire or Wish, that they had
" heretofore done every Thing as they
" ought to have done. Every one there-
" fore ought in every Action always to fa-
" miliarize *that Time*, as if it were present;
" for by this Means he will keep up an
" exact Regard to Virtue and Goodness.
" But if the *wicked Demon* stands near him,
" influencing him to Wickedness, he ought

" to frequent the Altars and Temples of
 " the Gods, flying from Injustice [or Evil]
 " as the wickedest and cruellest Mistress,
 " praying the Gods to help to drive her
 " away. Let him moreover have Recourse
 " to Men, who have a Reputation for Vir-
 " tue, and hear them Discourse about a
 " truly happy Life, and the Punishment of
 " wicked Men, that he may turn from a
 " wicked Life."

Here Mr. *Warburton* stops; but he might have gone on,--- "That he may turn from a wicked Life, dreading the avenging Demons, or, that always remember what is done. Let all that dwell in the City worship the Gods, according to their Country Rites.---Let no Man love another State more than his own Country, because the Gods of his own Country are displeased with him for so doing." *ibid.* 61.

The Observations naturally arising from this Preface of *Zaleucus* are,

I. He speaks of the Gods with great Reverence and Respect; and he (*c*) begins with inculcating on his People, that every

(c) Καταβαλόμενος ἐξαρχῆς καίνη γόμοθεσίαν, ἀρξαῖς τρῶν πεὶ τὴν ἐπιφάνειαν θῶν. *Diod. Sic.* l. 12. p. 84.

Inhabitant ought to be persuaded of their “*Existence.*” But here is not a Word of a *future State* of Punishments or Rewards, as the *Sanction* of his Laws: No, nor are his Laws so much as *prefaced* or *introduced* with any Notion of Providence “*in its full Extent.*” He says, That the Gods are “the Authors of all the good Things “which we enjoy:” By which he means only the *present* good Things, whatever they are; the good Things, τῶν καλὰ λόγων γνησιερῶν, which by any Means happen to us. And with a View to the obtaining these “Good Things,” he says, “He “that would make himself *beloved by the Gods*, should to the best of his Power be *good both in Principle and Practice.*” Had he designed to speak of a *future State*, or to say that God would punish Men *bereafter*, He would not have given this Reason, why Men should keep their Minds *pure and free from all Evil*, “*because God is not honoured by a wicked Man;*” but his Thought would naturally have carried him to have mentioned that Part of the Scheme of Providence, which would have struck much more forcibly on the Minds of Men.

2. He says, *that* wicked Men should “dread the never-forgetting, or avenging Demons.” Why they should do this, is not on account of any Notion of a *future State*, but to avoid *present Temporal Evils*, such as affect private Families, or public Safety. And that this was the only Use that was intended by inculcating the Fear of *avenging Demons*, will appear, when we come to consider *Charondas's Preface*.

3. When *Zaleucus* speaks of the *Punishments* which the Gods *send upon the Wicked*, he speaks of them as doing it in the *present Time*; not saying what the Gods would do *bereafter*, or expressing himself in Relation to *Futurity*, but as *ἐπιπεμψόν*, now *sending* the Evils. Mr. *Warburton* here misleads his Reader by translating this Passage thus.—*The Judgments they always have in STORE for wicked Men*; for by this he plainly means something that is *future*: but *Zaleucus* speaks not of Judgments kept *in Store*, but immediately issued out upon Offenders. When,

4. He speaks of the *tutelar Gods of the Country* being *angry* with any one that prefers or loves more any other Country than his

own,

own,---It was not with any View to *future Punishments* or a *future State*; but it wholly relates to their *present State* and Circumstances, *as Θεῶν πατρῶν νεμεσάντων.* The Tutelar Gods would at *present* be angry, and not preserve them, nor take any care about them.

Lastly, He adds, (*d*) that “*after the Gods, and Demons, and Heroes, Parents and the Laws and the Governors should be next in Honour amongst Men that have Sense and Understanding, and that would be kept safe.*” It is not any *future Punishment*, but a *present* one, the *Safety* of the People or State, that is made the Effect of honouring the Gods and Demons, and *Laws* that were instituted for their great Security. So that from Zaleucus’s *Preface* to his *Laws*, nothing appears of any Notion of a Providence *in its full Extent*; much less is it made the Grand *Sanction* of his *Laws*; nor has Mr. *Warburton proved*, that the Old Legislators meant a Providence *in*

(d) Μέτα Θεών, καὶ Δαίμονας καὶ ἥρωες, γονεῖς τε καὶ νόμοις ὑπερχοντες συνεγγύεισι ταῖς τιμαῖς παῖς ἀνθρώποις νοῦν ἔχουσι καὶ ΣΩΤΗΣΟΜΕΝΟΙΣ. Stob. ibid.

24 *The C o n d u c t of the*
its full Extent : but has taken for granted
what He was to prove.

And indeed if one considers it with any Accuracy, it is impossible it should be proved, I would not willingly be disputing about a Word, and therefore must previously observe, That by the *Sanction* of a Law is usually meant the Reward or Penalty annexed to any Law, in order to enforce its Observation upon the Subject. In order to make a Law obtain its End, and to overcome the Pravity or the Obstinacy of Mankind by working on their *Fears*, it was always customary for, and Legislators have thought it necessary, *Sancire pœnis legum observantiam, to enforce by Penalties the Observation of Laws*: And as Mankind have other Passions and Affections, which may be influenced as well as *Fear*, it has been thought by all Legislators not improper to lay hold of them too ; and by encouraging *Hopes* by Promise of *Rewards*, to excite their Subjects to Rightness of Action.

Mr. Warburton I know has a Notion, “ That the Sanction of *Rewards* neither “ was, nor could be, enforced by Society “ for the Observance of its Laws.” p. 15. What

What He means by this odd Language, to enforce the Sanction of Rewards, I profess I know not. He elsewhere tells us, " That " Moses deliver'd to the Israelites a complete Digest of Law and Religion,--- and " for the Observance of his entire Institution he added the Sanction of Rewards " and Punishments : Both which we have " shewn to be necessary for the Support of " a Republic ; and yet that Civil Society, " as such, can administer only one, namely " Punishments." Vol. II. p. 447. It is not worth while to digress so far as to enquire what is meant by these Passages. It is sufficient to observe, that Civil Society can reward Particulars for any eminent Services : nay it can by Law enact Rewards for such as shall merit them by their good Behaviour, in particular Circumstances, whether it be by ordering Honours, or Money, or by any other Encouragement, which it may think fit to propose. This is what Politicians mean, and all they mean, when they talk of the Sanction of Rewards ; and This, Society can give ; and if to this be added the Sanction of Punishments, These are properly

26 *The C o n d u c t of the*
properly called “ the two Pillars of Go-
“ vernment.”

But then if the Good or Evil proposed by Legislators in order to enforce their Laws, be something out of the Power of the Legislator to put in Execution, it implies an Absurdity in them to make such Reward or Punishment the *Sanction* of their Laws. The Penalties therefore, or the Happiness of a *future State*, can only be annexed to such Laws as God is the immediate Author of ; because God alone can put them in Execution : and accordingly the *Law of Nature*, and the *Christian Law*, have a *future State* of Rewards and Punishments for their Sanction. But a Human Law, with *such* a Sanction annexed to the Observation or Violation of it, is the same Thing as having *no* Sanction to it at all, because the Legislator cannot secure Obedience by that which he cannot execute. For,

Let us suppose, that *Zaleucus* had been the Institutor of a Body of Laws ; or any other Legislator of Old had instituted such Laws as *Zaleucus* did ; and had made a *future State* the Sanction of his Laws,-- what must have been the Consequence ? Suppose that

that a wicked Man among the *Lorrians* had been guilty of Murder, Theft, or any other Crime condemn'd by *Zaleucus*: The Law must be put in Execution. Bid then the Man, as *Zaleucus* bids him, *think of God as existing and sending his Judgments*: Tell him of a Change of Life, and of the Repentance he now hath: Tell him how much he now wishes at the Hour of Death to have acted a righteous, just and honest Part: Tell him all that *Zaleucus* commands.— And will not the Law be fully executed, when its grand *Sanction* is thus administred? If this be the *Sanction* of the Law, it shews the Absurdity of making such a *Sanction*, and that Mr. *Warburton* has invented a new Sort of Language, which the Writers on Politics are Strangers to.

Cicero very justly calls the (*e*) *Belief of the Gods, and of their Providence, their Government of all Things, their Knowledge of whatever is done, and the Distinction that is*

(*e*) *Sit igitur hoc jam principio persuasum civibus, Dominos esse omnium rerum ac moderatores Deos: eaque quæ geruntur, eorum geri vi, ditione atque numine: eosdemque optime de genere hominum mereri: et qualis quisque sit, quid agat, quid in se admittat, qua mente, qua pietate colat religiones, intueri: piorum et impiorum habere rationem.*
Cic. de Leg. Lib. II.

to be put by them between Good and Evil Men not the *Sanction* of a Law (which no Legislator ever did) but the *Proæmium* of the Law. He calls indeed these (*f*) Opinion USEFUL, since so many Things are confirmed and settled by Oaths; and he observes, that the Fear of Divine Punishments has restrained many from acting wickedly. But he never looked upon these Opinions as the *Sanction* of his Laws; but as Principles which he would have the People fully persuaded of as highly useful to make them good and just. No Argument, or Reason for obeying a Law, is the Sanction of a Law, but only such Penalty or Reward as is annexed to the Law to encourage Obedience to it, and which the Legislator can put in Execution.

You will tell me perhaps, that Cicero speaking particularly of Zaleucus and Charondas, mentions Plato, as (*g*) imitating them, and thinking it to be the Business of a Law to persuade something, and not to do

(*f*) Utiles esse autem has Opiniones quis neget, cum intelligat quam multa firmentur Jurejurando,—quam multos divini supplicii metus a scelere revocarit.—Habes Legis Proæmium; sic enim hoc appellat Plato. *ibid.*

(*g*) Quos imitatus Plato, hoc quoque Legis putavit esse, persuadere aliquid, non omnia vi ac minis cogere. *ibid.*

every Thing by Force and Threats. He does so: And if persuasive Arguments are put into a Body of *Utopian*, or other, Laws, no great Harm is done. But what Part of a Law is *Persuasion*? What Part of it is Argument and Reasoning? Is that, in any Sense, the *Sanction* of it? No. Mr. Warburton has in this very Section, where he is recommending *Zaleucus*'s Preface as an *admirable Remain*; He, I say, has made use of another Term, I believe less common among Legislators than even Persuasion.—

"*To the common run*, says he, *of more intractable and perverse Spirits*, He [*Zaleucus*] preaches up the *Doctrine of future Rewards and Punishments.*" p. 128. Is preaching up a Doctrine the same as making it the *Grand Sanction* of a Law? I say,

But where is it that *Zaleucus* "preaches up a future State of Rewards and Punishments to the common Run of intractable and perverse Spirits?" What he says to them is, *That they should keep in their Minds the Thought of the Gods*, as existing and sending Punishments on the wicked: Not in a future State, as I have observed, but at present; not in the other World, but in this. It

He

He therefore never made either a Providence in *its full Extent*, the *Sanction* of his Laws; nor did he *preface* his Laws with it in *its full Extent*; and therefore we are disappointed in the Proof of the very first Thing that is necessary to Mr. *Warburton's Demonstration.*

But perhaps Mr. *Warburton* means by the Word *Sanction*, whatever in general may work on the Hopes or Fears of Men to engage them to observe a Law. If therefore the Doctrine of a future State of Rewards and Punishments will most effectually work upon Mens Passions, and make them observe the Law,--This may be called the grand Sanction of the Law. Be it so. “The Step
“ then which the Legislators took to propagate Religion was, by making the Doctrine of a Providence, with which in *its full Extent* they prefaced and introduced their Laws, the grand Sanction of their Institutions.”

I would observe, 1. That Mr. *Warburton* must mean that ALL the Legislators, *Moses* excepted, did so. Now that it was not customary for the Old Legislators in general, to *preface* their Laws with any Thing about the

the Gods; or a Providence, taking this in its full Extent, or not, seems plain enough from what *Cicero* has said. He mentions *Plato*, and the Two whom *Plato* follow'd, *Zaleucus* and *Charondas*, who prefaced their Laws with Arguments to move People to believe, that all Things were governed by the Gods. Had this been customary to ALL Legislators, *Cicero* would not have mentioned these *Three*, and only these, whose Method He approved ; but He would have used some universal Expression, that would have implied that ALL were wont to make the Divine Providence the Foundation of their Laws. He approved therefore this Method rather than that of Others, who wrote Books of *Laws* or *Politics* without taking any Notice at all of the Existence of the Gods, or of a Providence: He approved, I say, *Plato's*, *Zaleucus's* and *Charondas's* Method of Legislation, who began with inculcating a Providence, rather than that of some others, who take Notice of the Gods, as it were only by Accident in their Laws.

It does not then appear that ALL the Old Legislators did inculcate the Doctrine of a Pro-

a Providence, whether in its full Extent or not, in order to induce their Subjects to observe their Laws. It does not appear that this was their constant, uniform, *universal* Method; rather, that it was peculiar to *some* only to use this Method. But then if ALL did not do it, how will the Divine Legation of *Moses* be demonstrated from his *Omission* of the *Doctrine of a future State*, more than the Divine Legation of others, who have omitted it as well as He?

I have already consider'd the Proœmium to *Zaleucus's Laws*, and I think it may be fairly asked, where is it that He mentions a *future State*? Or what Words will prove, that he taught a *future State of Rewards and Punishments*? If the Words, which Mr. *Warburton* pitches upon, *viz.* What “He “*preached up to those of a more intractable “and perverse Turn of Mind,*” proves, that He taught or inculcated the *Doctrine of Providence in its full Extent*; then I am not without Hopes of demonstrating (for now I propose to demonstrate on such Data) that *Moses* made a *future State of Rewards and Punishments* the *Sanction* of his *Laws*, exactly

actly in the same manner as *Zaleucus* did.
Let us compare them.

Moses speaks of God not only as *existing*, and every where inculcates that Doctrine, but he speaks of him as *the righteous Judge of all the Earth*, as *the God of the Spirits of all Flesh*. Gen. xviii. 25. Num. xxvii. 16. xvi. 22. And he bids the *Israelites* fear *this glorious and fearful! Name, the Lord thy God*. Deut. xxviii. 58. When God is called by *Moses*, *the God of the Spirits of all Flesh*, in the lowest Sense it signifies, that He is the *Lord of the Life of all*; He in whose Hand is the Soul of every living Thing, and the Breath of all Mankind, as it is expressed, Job xii. 10. Do not these Passages of *Moses* contain at least as much as *Zaleucus's* do, where he bids wicked Men remember the Gods, and think upon their Nature? *Moses* is not content with such low, lifeless Language as *Zaleucus* is, but he says with the utmost Energy,---Behold the Heaven and the Heaven of Heavens is the Lord thy God's, the Earth also, and all that therein is.--Be no more stiff-necked; for the Lord your God is God of Gods and Lord of Lords, a great God, a mighty and a terrible, which regard-

eth not Persons, nor taketh Reward. He doth execute the Judgment of the Fatherless and the Widow. Deut. x. *Zaleucus tells the wicked Man, that he should think of the Judgments which the Gods send on such.* And has not *Moses* urged this Topic in the strongest manner through several whole Chapters? Is a future State proved from *Zaleucus's* mentioning the *Hour of Death?* And does not *Moses* mention the *Wish to die the Death of the Righteous?* Num. xxiii. 10. Or when *Judgments* in general are mentioned by the one, may not they be interpreted by the *Judgments* which the other has threatened, the terriblest Evils that could happen to Mankind, till *they were destroyed, and perish because of the Wickedness of their Doings?*

I cannot therefore but conclude, that whatever are the Words in *Zaleucus*, from which Mr. *Warburton* concludes, that HE made a future State of Rewards and Punishments the Sanction of his Laws, similar Expressions in *Moses*, or if Occasion be, much stronger, will prove that *Moses* likewise did the same. The Truth is, none of the Legislators of Old ever made the
Doctrine

Doctrine of a future State the *Sanction* of their Laws more than *Moses* did : and consequently all that is said on this Subject about *Sanctions*, is either a new undefined Language of Mr. *Warburton*, or else it is pure Mistake and Confusion.

Be it then granted, that “ Religion, “ which teaches an over-ruling Providence “ of Good Men, and the Punisher of ill, “ is necessary to Society.” *Moses* has “ taught an over-ruling Providence, and a “ Religion,” as well as *Zaleucus*, and has made it the *Sanction* of his Laws as much as *Zaleucus*; and has extended his Notion of Providence as far as *Zaleucus* has done : And if so, he has established a future State of Rewards and Punishments, as much as *Zaleucus* has. But to proceed.

Charondas is mentioned by *Cicero*, as well as *Zaleucus*: And one may wonder that the *Proœmium* to his Laws is not expressly cited by Mr. *Warburton*, as well as *Zaleucus*'s *Proœmium* was. The One is full as much to the Purpose as the Other; but neither of them will prove, that a Providence *in its full Extent* was either the

36 *The C o n d u c t of the
Sanction of, or contained in the Preface to,
their Laws.*

In Charondas's Proœmium, there are these *Instructions*: That (*b*) in all *Consultation and Action* Men ought to begin with the Gods: for it is best to believe, that God is the Cause of all these Things: That you ought to abstain from Evil Actions, especially to shew your Concord and Agreement with God; for God has no Communion with any wicked Men.--- Let none behave impudently, but let every one behave with Modesty, as by that Means likely to have God propitious, and to obtain Security: for no wicked Man is beloved by God. --- You ought to shew to Governors the same Benevolence as you do to your Parents, obeying them, and paying them Respect. He that is otherwise disposed will suffer Punishment from the tutelar Demons of the State,

(*b*) Τὰς βιλομένως καὶ πρατζούσας τι οὐδὲ Θεῶν ἀρχεῖσθαι χρή. Τὸ γαρ ἀριστὸν ὥσπερ ἡ παρειμία φατὶ τὸν Θεὸν ἦμεν αἰτίου πάντων τέλων. "Ετι δὲ φαύλων πρᾶξεων ἀπέχεσθαι, καὶ μάλιστα διὰ τὰν πρᾶξιν τὸν Θεὸν ευμβελίαν. Οὐδενὸς γαρ ἀδίκη Θεὸν κοινωνέν. — Μηδὲν ἔστω ἀνοεῖσθαι, ἀλλὰ σαφρονεῖται ἐκαργος, ὡς τέλω τευχόμενος Θεὸν ἰλεων καὶ σωτηρίαν. Οὐδεὶς γαρ κακὸς θεοφιλότης. — Χρὴ δὲ καὶ πρᾶξις ἀρχούσας ἕνοιαν διαφυλάττειν, καθάπερ πατρικῆν, ἐυπειθῶντας καὶ σεβομένες. "Ως ὁ μὴ διανοούμενος δύτω τίσει δίκιον κακῆς βιλῆς δαίμοσιν ἐτιώχοις. "Αρχούσες γαρ ἐτιώχεσσι πόλεως καὶ πολιτῶν σωτηρίας. — "Ἐστι μέρισα ἀδικήματα, Θεόν παταραγμένης &c.

for

for his wicked Intention or Will. For these Demons are the Governors and Patrons of the City, and of the Safety of the Citizens. -- Let Contempt of the Gods be deem'd the greatest Wickedness.--- Thus far Charondas.

The Question here is, how far Charondas made a *future State* the *Sanction* of his Laws: Or how much he taught the Doctrine of *Providence in its full Extent* in this Proœmium? And I answer, not at all. He commands indeed, that all his People should learn what he calls these *Prefaces*, προσίμια; but it is evident here is no mention of a *future State* in them. Nay, the Punishments, which the *Patron Demons* of the State were to inflict for any Crimes, were all *Temporal*, and *present*, such as affected the σωτεία, the Safety or Security of the State. Thus e. g. One of his Laws is (*i*) *That a Wife ought to be chaste, and not to admit any unlawful Converse with other Men.* Why? Not that Adultery would be punished in a *future State*, but to *prevent the Anger of the Demons, who turn'd People out of*

(*i*) Γυναικες σωφρονεῖν χρή, καὶ μὴ προσδέχεσθαι συνυπίαν ἀσεβῆ παρ' ἄλλων ἀνδρῶν, ὡς ἀπαντώσας νεμέσος παρὰ δαιμόνων καὶ ἔξοικισάν καὶ ἐχρωποιῶν. Stobæ. Ser. 42.

their Houses, *and caused Enmities and Hatred.* These avenging Demons were *εἰσιχόι*, *Lares*, *Household Gods*, and punished as such; and all the Punishment he speaks of as coming from them was *temporal*, and such as affected *σωτηρίαν*, the *Safety of the Body politic*, or particular Persons.

Here we see what is most probably the Meaning of *ἀλάσοπας δαιμόνος*, *the Demons that do not forget what is done by any Body*, in *Zaleucus*. They were the same as the *εἰσιχόι*, *the Household Gods of Charondas*; and these punished (*k*) by *turning People out of their Houses*, by *occasioning Quarrels, Disputes, Hatred, and Aversion*; So too, what *Zaleucus* calls, *represών Θεῶν*, *Charondas* expresses by *ἀπανθόστις ρεψόστις παρὰ δαιμόνων*, *Vengeance falling upon Men from those tutelar Gods*. And what this Vengeance consisted in, being expressly said to be by *turning People out of Doors*, and *creating Hatred*, it is plain here is nothing relating to a *future State* in this Legislator's Preface.

Let us next examine what *Cicero* has said in the Proœmium to his Books of Laws;

(k) Ἔξοικισῶν καὶ ἐχθροποιῶν. *ibid.*

He wrote for an *Utopian Commonwealth*; the Others whom he imitated, and made his Patterns, wrote Laws for real States. If therefore he goes no further than they did, as to the Point now in Question, we may be sure, that it was not usual for the Legislators to make the Doctrine of a Providence in *its full Extent*, the Sanction of their Laws.

Cicero's Proœmium was thus, (*I*) " Let
" the Citizens first of all be firmly per-
" suaded, that the Gods are Lords and
" Governors of all Things; that whatever
" is done is directed by their Power,---that
" they know what every one does,--- and
" accordingly they make a *Distinction be-*
" *tween Good and Evil Men.* Minds tho-
" roughly imbued with these Things, will

(*I*) Sit igitur hoc a principio persuasum civibus, Dominos esse omnium rerum ac moderatores Deos, eaque quæ ge-
runtur, eorum geri vi, ditione ac numine,—Et qualis quisque fit, quid agat intueri, piorumque et impiorum habere ra-
tionem. His enim rebus imbutæ mentes, haud sane abhor-
rebunt ab utili et a vera sententia.—Utiles esse autem has
Opiniones, quis neget, cum intelligat, quam multa firmentur
jurejurando; quantæ salutis sint foederum religiones; quam
multos divini supplicii metus a scelere revocarit; quāmque
sancta sit societas civium inter ipsos; Diis immortalibus inter-
positis tum judicibus tum testibus? Habetur Legis Proœmium.
De Leg. ii.

“ scarce ever avoid doing what is truly
“ useful, and Right in itself.— That these
“ Opinions are *useful*, who can deny, when
“ he considers how *many Things are con-*
“ *firmed by the Religion of Oaths*; and how
“ much Security the *Sacredness of Treaties*
“ affords; How many the *Fear of divine*
“ *Punishment* does keep from *Wickedness*;
“ And how firm must the Society and
“ Friendship of Citizens be betwixt one
“ another, when the Gods are conceived
“ not only to interpose themselves, but to
“ be Witnesses of what is done. You have
“ here the *Proœmium of the Law.*”—

The *Laws* themselves have nothing to the Purpose, unless it be contained (*m*) in the *Manner* in which he orders Men to *approach the Gods*, or in the Declaration, that those, who approach the Gods without Piety, *God himself will punish*.

Which now of these *Words*, or what *Proposition* contained in them, teaches the Doctrine of a Providence *in its full Extent*, more than the Law of *Moses* does? The Usefulness of the Notion of a Providence to

(*m*) Ad Divos adeunto casté; pietatem adhibento; —qui secus faxit, Deus ipse vindex erit. *ibid.*

Society is not the Point in Question : *Moses* has urged the sacred Tie of *Oaths*, and the *Fear of God*, and the Dread of his *Punishments*, in as strong Terms as *Cicero*, or any Legislator whatever. Has *Cicero* said, *Let those who approach the Gods be pure and undefiled* : *Let them be pious* : *God himself will punish the Transgressor*? *Moses* has said the same Things as strongly, nay more so, and therefore should be understood in the same Manner at least, and in the same Extent, as *Cicero* : --- *Ye shall be Holy, for I am Holy*. *Lev.* xi. 44. *Thou shalt love the Lord thy God, with all thine Heart, with all thy Soul, and with all thy Might*. *Deut.* vi. 5. *The Lord your God is God of Gods*, --- mighty and terrible, serve him. *Deut.* x. 17. 20. Does *Cicero* speak of the Ties of Citizens to one another, and the Usefulness of Religion to band them together, and make them love one another? *Moses* has done the same by express Law, enjoining them to *love their Neighbour as themselves*, *Lev.* xix. 18. and not to treat one another with *Rigor* for this Reason, *I am the Lord your God*, *Lev.* xxv. 43, 48. Does *Cicero* speak of God as being the *Judge*, as well as *Witness* of human Actions ?

Actions? How frequently does *Moses* speak of God, as the *Judge* of all the Earth; as the *Judge* betwixt one and another; as *looking on* and *judging*? And if there be any Stress to be laid upon the other Word, *Witness*, God is expressly said to be *Witness*, and appealed to under that Character, *Gen. xxxi. 50.*

Take now the Proemium of *Zaleucus*, of *Charondas*, or of *Tully*, and whatever Words *in them* are supposed to contain the Doctrine of a Providence *in its full Extent*, the same Words in *Moses* (especially when they are much stronger) must be allowed to contain the same Doctrine, and in the same Extent. And if Mr. *Warburton* will call such Doctrine the *Sanction* of *Zaleucus's*, or *Charondas's*, or *Tully's* Laws (let that Word signify what he pleases) it must or ought to signify the same Thing in Regard to *Moses's* Law. So that hitherto *Moses* and the other old Legislators are at least upon a *Par*, since no Difference can be produced *in these Respects*, between them. It will ever be asked,--- How does it appear, that *Charondas*, e. g. made the Doctrine of a Providence *in its full Extent*, the Sanction of his

his Laws? If the Answer be,--- He mentions the Duty of Beginning every Action *with the Gods*; that a Contempt of them is the highest Crime; that they are the Cause of all Things; that God has no Communion with wicked Men.--- These Opinions, as Cicero well says, are USEFUL to the State: But do they imply a Providence *in its full Extent*, or only a Providence in general? Do they relate to what will happen to Men *after Death*; or only to what concerns the *σωτηρία*, the Safety and Security of the State? Let the Reader judge. It is certain, that there is not a Word in the *Proœmium* to his Laws, nor in that of Zaleucus, or of Tully who imitated them, where a *future State* is expressly mentioned, or a Providence *in its full Extent*; and there are several which confine the Punishments of the Gods or Dæmons, to *present Evils*. So that hitherto no Circumstance, no Fact, is produced by Mr. Warburton, which proves a Difference betwixt Moses, and all other Legislators; at least none sufficient to make the Foundation of a Demonstration.

My first Objection then to Mr. Warburton's Scheme is, That no one old Legislator,
that

44 *The C o n d u c t of the*
that ever made Laws for the Government
of any People, or that wrote even for an
Utopian Commonwealth, ever made a *fu-*
ture State the *Sanction* of his Laws. My
second is, that from whatever Words Mr.
Warburton attempts to prove, that *Zaleucus*
or *Charondas*, in particular, mentioned a
future State, or a Providence *in its full Extent*, by the very same it may be proved,
that *Moses* has done the same. When there-
fore He attempts to *demonstrate* (for nothing
short of Demonstration will content him)
the divine Legation of Moses by the Medium
of no future State of Reward and Punish-
ment in the Mosaic Dispensation, He must
equally demonstrate the *divine Legation of*
Zaleucus and Charondas, and Cicero; since
none of them, nor indeed any one else of the
old Legislators ever made a Providence *in*
its full Extent, or a *future State of Rewards*
and *Punishments*, the *Sanction* of their
Laws. The most they did was, to make
the *Doctrine of Providence*, as all Things
were directed and governed by it, as all
Things were taken Notice of by the Gods,
as they were the *Avengers* of wicked *Ac-*
tions, some Part of the *Proæmium or Pre-*
amble

amble to their Laws ; or perhaps inserted this Notion into the Laws themselves : But how far they extended their Notion of Providence, is no where said.

But Mr. Warburton has " beg'd the Reader always to have in Mind, that when in the Sequel of his Discourse, he meets with antient Testimonies for the Necessity of *Religion* to Society, he may be confident, that the Doctrine of a future State of Rewards and Punishments, was the chief Idea included in that Term."

p. 89. 3d Ed. 87. Let us comply with this Request, and take it for granted, that the Doctrine of a future State of Rewards and Punishments is included in, or " must be principally meant" by the Word *Religion*. (Though this is a Point which Mr. Warburton ought particularly to have proved, because he has labour'd to shew, that by the Jewish Legislator these two Ideas were in Fact kept distinct :) But let it be granted him for the present. Now, if the chief Idea that is included in the Term, *Religion*, be a future State of Rewards and Punishments, and if it be a Doctrine Essential to *Religion in general*; if it be the very Fundamental of Fundamentals,

Fundamentals, as he assures us in the Dedication of the second Volume, p. xxiii. then the *Jews* never had any *Religion* at all, because they wanted what was *essential* to Religion in general ; nay, what was the very Fundamental of Fundamentals. *Moses* therefore gave that People no *Religion* at all : But all the Heathen World had Religion, founded on and supported by the Doctrine of a future State of Rewards and Punishments. So much happier were the Heathens, than those to whom *Moses* was sent with a divine Legation.

Mr. *Warburton* has laid down this as an Universal Truth, “ That the People throughout the whole Earth, universally believed a future State of Rewards and Punishments properly so called.” Vol. I. p. 306. third Edition, p. 332. Be this allowed ; for I cannot but think it to be true. Now the Points he was to prove are, *First*, That there is a Difference between the *Jews*, and all the rest of Mankind ; or that the *Jews* did not believe what all the World besides universally did believe. And *Secondly*, that there is a Difference betwixt the Lawgiver of the *Jews* and *Zaleucus*, and all other Lawgivers

Lawgivers whatever, in that *Moses* did *not*, and all other Lawgivers *did*, make the Doctrine of a Providence *in its full Extent*, or a *future* State of Rewards and Punishments, either the *Preface* to, or the *Sanction* of their Laws. I own, I cannot but think, from what I have yet seen, that *Moses* may be proved to have made a *future* State as much the *Sanction* of his Laws, as any other Old Legislator did; and that all must be equally condemned, or equally acquitted by this Writer. Mr. *Warburton* ought not to suppose, that the *Jews* alone did not believe a Doctrine which all the World besides is acknowledged universally to have believed, “even before Civil Policy was instituted among Mankind.” p. 91, or 92. He owns too, that “*Moses* did not disbelieve a future State.” Vol. II. p. 449, 479. Say then that *Moses* believed a future State; and say that *Zaleucus* did so: The Subjects too of both equally believed it, unless something very express can be produced to the contrary. Now *Moses* has at least as much of a *future* State in his Laws, as *Zaleucus* or *Charondas* has in either of theirs. If *Moses* has not mentioned it expressly, neither

neither has *Zaleucus* or *Charondas*. Or if you say that these last have mentioned it, I shall say that *Moses* has as much ; nay more, as will appear presently. Nor is it enough in Mr. *Warburton* to shew, that *Moses* never mentions a *future State*, for it may be shewn that neither have *Zaleucus*, nor the other Legislators here cited ; and if any *one* of them has omitted to do it, the Demonstration taken from the mere *Omission* of a future State, design'd in Favour of a *Divine Legation*, will equally hold good for such other Legislators. Should Mr. *Warburton* say, that those other Legislators *suppose* a future State as the Foundation and Support of Religion : I shall say the same of *Moses*. In Truth, it was a Doctrine universally received and believed by *Jews* as well as *Gentiles* : and therefore all the Old Legislators established their respective *National Religions* upon Principles already allowed and admitted ; and therefore had no Necessity to mention that Notion particularly, either as the *Sanction* of their Laws, or in any other Manner. And that this was the Truth in Relation to *Moses* in particular will be seen presently.

Mr.

Mr. Warburton has told us, that future Rewards and Punishments were not only *not the Sanction of the Mosaic Dispensation, but were not taught in it at all: and that in Consequence of this Omission,* the PEOPLE had not *this Doctrine for many Ages.* Vol. II. p. 446.

This is a *Consequence*, which Mr. Warburton is much too hasty in Drawing. Suppose I should argue in the very same manner, --- Future Rewards and Punishments were not the *Sanction of Zaleucus's or Charondas's Institutions:* nay “*were not taught in them at all.*” Therefore, “*in Consequence of the Omission,*” the *Locrians and the Crotoniates* had not this Doctrine. They must have been without this Doctrine, as well as the *Jews*, if being without it is the *Consequence* of their Legislators not making it the *Sanction* of their Laws. If therefore Both these People had this Notion (as Mr. Warburton assures us, all had it *universally* except the *Jews*) then by the same Way by which these People came by it, the *Jews might have had it, notwithstanding the Omission of their Legislator.*

E

But

But I am now enquiring into a Fact.
“ The People of the Jews had not this
“ Doctrine for many Ages.” How is this
proved ? Mr. Warburton grants, “ That
“ Moses did *not disbelieve* a future State of
“ Rewards and Punishments.” Vol. II.
p. 479. and hence he draws this Conse-
quence ; “ From my holding that *Moses* did
“ *not disbelieve* a future State, it follows,
“ that all such Texts of Scripture as are
“ brought to prove, that the *antient* Jews
“ *believed the Soul survived the Body* are no-
“ thing at all to the Purpose ; but do, on
“ the contrary, greatly support my Opinion.”
ibid. Nay, He tells us, that “ *Moses well*
“ *understood it*”. p. 449. Elsewhere we are
told, “ That throughout all Antiquity we
“ do not find any civilized Country where
“ the Doctrine of a future State of Rewards
“ and Punishments was not of *National*
“ *Belief.*” Vol. I. p. 88.

The Jews then, Descendants of some
who had this “ *National Belief,*” are ac-
knowledged “ *to believe the Soul survived the*
“ *Body,*” both here and p. 556. Mr. War-
burton grants too, that “ *Moses* being ne-
cessitated to mention *Enoch’s Translation*,
“ *it*

" it could not be but that a *separate Existence*
" might be infer'd, how obscurely foever the
" Story was deliver'd." There is then no
Occasion to produce Instances from *Moses*,
which shew very clearly, that the *Jews* did
believe the Existence and Life of the Soul
after its Departure hence. However I will
add one Passage, which Mr. *Warburton* has
overlook'd, and that is the Prohibition in
the Law to consult *Necromancers*, or Per-
sons that pretended to advise with the *Dead*,
which supposes at least a *popular Notion* pre-
vailing, that the Soul survived the Body ;
and not only survived the Body, and con-
tinued in mere Existence, but retained Con-
sciousness and Thought, and knew what
was doing and to be done on Earth. And
so popular was this Notion, as to have a
Law directed against such Practices. Since
Moses therefore *did not disbelieve*, nay, *well understood* the Doctrine of a future State of
Rewards and Punishments ; and the People
believed, that the Soul survived the Body, in
the Manner I have mention'd : What Rea-
son is there to think, that they did not *be-
lieve* a future State of Rewards and Punish-
ments, which their Forefathers, and their

52 *The C o n d u c t of the
Guide and Legislator, and all the World
besides believed?*

I do not apprehend, that the *People* of the *Jews*, or any other Nation, entered into the Philosophical Notion of the Souls returning into God, or into the $\tau\delta\ \xi\nu$, or $\tau\delta\ \pi\tilde{\alpha}\nu$, or whatever Whims much later Ages than what we are now speaking of, produced. Nor can such a Notion be reconciled to the *Necromancy* practised amongst them. They supposed therefore separate Souls, separately existing, capable of being *call'd out*, and *consulted*, as *knowing* more than we Mortals know. If they proceeded thus far, it is impossible to prove the Negative, that they did not believe a future State of Rewards and Punishments, unless positive, very clear Evidence could be produced to the contrary.

The Conduct of the Legislators in Relation to their " making the Doctrine of a " Providence, with which in its full Extent they *prefaced* and introduced their " Laws, the *grand Sanction* of their Institutions," has been sufficiently consider'd : And if the Remarks I have made be just, the Consequence is plain. Before I have done with the *Legislators*, it will be proper

to

to consider the next Step which they took, which was to "affirm and establish the general Doctrine of a Providence, which they had delivered in their *Laws*, by a very particular and popular Method of inculcating the Belief of a future State of Rewards and Punishments." p. 133. or 3d Edit. p. 131.

The Attempt in the Third Section was to shew, that the *Legislators* made the Doctrine of a Providence in *its full Extent*, either the Preface to, or the grand Sanction of their *Laws*. Supposing this; then, That Doctrine must have been in *every Legislator's Institutes*, *Moses's* excepted. The Design of the Fourth Section is to shew, that "the Nature and End of the Mysteries were all the same, to teach the Doctrine of a future State." p. 133. THE LEGISLATOR then taught, one would imagine, one and the same Doctrine, both in his *Laws*, and in the *Mysteries*; and the only Difference was, in the one it was taught *openly*; in the other, under the *Seal of Secrecy*. One cannot but think too, that, *The Legislator*, is of the same Extent in Both these Sections, and means ALL LEGISLATORS; and therefore that ALL took both these Steps, That of their *Laws*, and That of the *Mysteries*, to inculcate a future

ture State of Rewards and Punishments.

Now that *All* Legislators did not so much as meddle with the *Mysteries*, or concern themselves about any such *particular Methods* of inculcating a future State, as the *Mysteries* taught, is indisputable. They had not the *Mysteries*, e.g. at *Rome*, in the Days of *Romulus* or *Numa*; nor probably till after, (if Mr. *Warburton* translates *Sacrificulus et vates* right, which I much doubt) till after that a “little Priest and Southsayer” brought them into *Etruria*. p. 172.

But let us suppose that by THE LEGISLATOR is only meant SOME Legislators; what was their Method of Proceeding? It was, it seems, to “affirm a certain general Doctrine of a Providence, and a future State, which they had deliver’d in their *Laws*.” But this does not seem to be the Case. The *Mysteries* were not invented to affirm the GENERAL Doctrine of a Providence, but to explain a *particular* Branch of it: It was not to teach, or affirm, or establish a Doctrine, which was already, by Supposition, in the *Laws*; but it was to explain the PARTICULAR Doctrine of a Providence, as extending to Punishments or Rewards in a future Life. The *Mysteries* would have been in a great Measure useless,

less, if the Legislator made the Doctrine of a Providence in its full Extent public and open in his *Laws*. And since Mr. Warburton has proved the Usefulness of the Mysteries beyond all Doubt, it cannot be imagined, that the Legislator should put into his *Laws*, which were open and common to all, a Doctrine which was to be taught under the *religious Seal of Secrecy*. This is my First Difficulty.

My Second is This: The Legislator *instituted* the Mysteries; and He tells us, "the "Mysteries were originally *invented* by "Legislators." p. 177, or 183.

Clemens Alexandrinus on the contrary expressly assures us, that the Mysteries were invented by *Philosophers*. I shall cite the Passage, when I come to treat of the double Doctrine. But let us here admit them to be not *Philosophers*, but *Legislators*. Mr. Warburton then observes, "The Sages, "who brought them out of *Egypt*, and "propagated them in *Azia*, in *Greece*, and "Britain, were ALL Kings or Lawgivers." *ibid.* Now this is not so certain; unless He will set up in *Greece* a Race of *Women Lawgivers*.

givers. For *Herodotus* tells us, (*n*) that *Danaus's Daughters brought the Mysteries of Ceres out of Egypt, and taught them to the Pelasgian Women in Peloponnesus.* And these *Pelasgian Women* kept them up, and propagated them, till the *Dorians* drove the *Pelasgi* out of *Peloponnesus*; and then they were all lost except among the *Arca-dians*.

Again; Who was it that *introduced* or *propagated* the *Mysteries* in *Italy*? Was it not, as *Livy* tells us, a mean, pitiful (*o*) *Greek, Sacrificulus et vates*, a *Priest* and *Soothsayer*. Did not he propagate the *Mysteries* first in *Etruria*; and this to a few only at first, which afterwards by the Allurements of Drinking and other Pleasures spread among the People? Was not the Progress of these *Mysteries* to *Rome* the Effect of Private Persons **PROPAGATING** them without the Knowledge or Privity of the *Legislator*?

(*n*) Αἱ Δαναῖς θυγατέρες ἦσαρ ἀι τὴν τελετὴν ταύτην ἐξ Αἰσύπλικ ἔξαγαγόσαι, καὶ διδάξασαι τὰς Πελασγιώτιδας γυναικας. *Hérod.* I. 2. c. 171.

(*o*) Græcus ignobilis in Hetruriam primum venit,— *Sacrificulus et vates*, — *Initia erant, quæ primo paucis tradita sunt: deinde vulgari cæpta per viros, mulieresque. Additæ voluptates Religioni vini et epularum quo plurium animi il-çerentur.* *Liv.* I. xxxix.

3. Let us allow that they were *all Kings or Legislators* that *propagated* these *Mysteries*; and allow too, that those *Legislators*, who propagated the *Mysteries*, did by them inculcate the Belief of a future State; yet still this is far from proving that this was the Practice of *ALL Legislators*? What if some *Legislator*, or *Legislators*, *invented* the *Mysteries* in *Egypt*; and likewise that *some* of the same Sort of Men propagated them in *Afia*, and other Parts? There are certainly other *Legislators*, such as *Zaleucus* and *Charondas*, who have not spoken one Word about either the *secret Way* of teaching a future State by the *Mysteries*, or the *open Way* of making it the *Sanction* of their *Laws*? Suppose now that *Moses* has not said a Word about a future State in *his Law*, He is upon a Par with all *such Legislators* as those; and their Divine Legation from the Omission of a future State of Rewards and Punishments must stand or fall together.

Indeed were a Comparison to be made betwixt *Moses* and the *Legislators*, who invented, or propagated, the *Mysteries*, it must stand thus: *Moses* openly and clearly declared, and in *his Law* avowed the Doctrine of the *Unity*; nor could any *Mysteries* detect

detect *Polytheism*, or shew the Follies and Falshood of it, so expressly, or more so, than he did: He, as well as all Others, equally omitted the Doctrine of a *future State of Rewards and Punishments* in his Laws, which were design'd for the Government of the State: But then He *openly* taught his Subjects *in his Laws*, what the other Legislators never taught *in their Laws*; viz. the most important Doctrine of the *Unity*, and the Folly of *Polytheism*. It was an universally believ'd Notion, that there was a future State of Rewards and Punishments; and therefore neither He, nor the Legislators that invented the *Mysteries*, deliver'd in their Laws that Doctrine: or if the other Legislators had, they would have had not much Occasion for that Part of the *Mysteries*, where the same Doctrine was taught in the *utmost Secrecy*. And from the Invention of the *Mysteries* this Conclusion may be drawn, that the Legislators never made a future State the Sanction of their *Laws*, nor prefaced their Institutions with the Doctrine of a *Providence in its full Extent*.

But after all, who are the Persons that Mr. Warburton here means by THE
LEGISLATOR?

LEGISLATOR? It seems to be no more than SOME LEGISLATOR; *Somebody*, upon proper Occasion, and at a proper Time (no Body knows who or when) invented the *Mysteries*. The natural Way of comparing the Conduct of *Moses* and this Legislator seems to be this: The Doctrine of a future State (when I say a *future State*, I mean, that of Rewards and Punishments after the Soul is gone out of this Body) This Doctrine was *universally* believed. Mr. *Warburton* acknowledges it to be universally believed by all *except the Jews*; and I maintain that *They*, as well as the Heathen World, *believed* it; and there are Passages in the Law of *Moses*, which plainly enough intimate an Opinion received and *believed*, that the Souls of Men existed after their Departure hence; more plain and more express than any that can be produced from any Legislators, which Mr. *Warburton* has named to prove such a Belief amongst *their* Subjects. This Doctrine was universally believed. Now *Moses*, as a *Legislator*, was to lay down Laws to the *Jews*, and he was to incorporate their *National Religion* into their Civil Law. This was done, not by inculcating what was universally

versally received and believed to be true by them ; but by inculcating such Points as were to make the *National Religion* of the *Jews*. And in this he did exactly what those other Legislators did : What was *useful* to the State, he admitted into the Body of his *Laws* ; and *so far* as it was useful to the State : But further than That, neither He nor *Zaleucus* concerned themselves.

Whether this be a sufficient Reason or not for *Moses's* not insisting on, and inculcating a future State of Rewards and Punishments more particularly, I submit to you. It is enough for my Purpose to have shewn, that He made it as much the *Grand Sanction of his Laws*, and has *affirmed* it as much as the Inventors of the *Mysteries* did in *their Laws* ; or as Others did, who did not concern themselves with the *Mysteries* at all. The Consequence is so plain, that I need not repeat it, *viz.* If a *Divine Legation* can be proved by the *Medium of no future State of Rewards and Punishments* mentioned in a Body of *Laws*, the Divine Legation of *all* those, who have in their *Laws* never mentioned such a State, will be equally demonstrated,

Let us now look back, if you please, upon what Mr. *Warburton* undertook to prove, and review the manner in which he has attempted to prove his Point. The Thing to be first proved was, "that the inculcating " the Doctrine of a future State of Rewards " and Punishments is necessary to the Well- " being of Society." The Proof of this is taken from "the Conduct of *Legislators* and " *Institutors of Civil Society.*" What now is their Conduct?

i. They " pretended an extraordinary " Revelation from some God." That many of the Heathen Legislators did this, is certain: But if one may guess at the Ends they proposed by This, it was not for the Sake of *Religion*, but to gain the easier *Reception* of their Institutions; and that the People should not easily throw off what was contrived for their Good. (p) No, says Mr. *Warburton*, Those Legislators did not pre-

(p) The Scholiaſt on *Homer*, ſpeaking of *Minos Ody. 7.* ſays, φασὶ δὲ ἔλεος, ὡς ταῖς τῶν Σαστίχων γνώμαις & φά-
δίως πείδονται οἱ Καυρελαγύμενοι· ἀνίσθια δὲν αὐτὸν εἰς τὴν
Ἴδην διὰ ἐννεατίας συνθέναι νόμους, καὶ φέρονται διαβεβαι-
ζοται, ὡς τὸν τὸ Διὸς ἔτεν δεδομένοι. Some ſay that because Subjects do not easily obey the Determinations of Kings, therefore he pretended his Laws were given by *Jupiter*. *Plato* gives this Reason for it, that those Laws were and ought to be looked upon as sacred and unalterable, ſince they were made by the Gods. *De Leg. 1.*

tend to extraordinary Revelation, " for the
" Introduction and Reception of their
" Laws," p. 105. Let Mr. *Warburton* rea-
son as much as he pleases upon this Head,
he contradicts it all by an express and clear
Fact, no farther than thirteen Pages off,
where he cites *Pythagoras*, as " teaching his
" Scholars as the *most efficacious way of estab-*
lishing Civil Justice, to propagate the
" Opinion of the Gods having an intimate
" Intercourse with Mankind," p. 118.

His next Assertion is, That the Pretence
of having their Laws from some God or
Goddess " was not for *perpetuating* their In-
" stitutions." I admit that it was not de-
signed by *all* of them to *perpetuate*, or make
their Institutions *continue for ever*; and think
that it was principally that the People should
pay a *decent regard* to, and not wantonly
throw off what was designed for their Bene-
fit. However, if Mr. *Warburton* means,
that none of These Legislators did do it with
a Design to *perpetuate* their Laws, He says
this again at the Expence of a Contradiction,
since he owns that *Lycurgus* did attempt to
make his Laws *perpetual*. So that we have
Pythagoras and *Lycurgus* pretending to Inspi-
ration,

ration, or rather Revelation, for *Civil Pur-*
poses not *Religious* ones: and the Reasons
that induced them so to act, *might* naturally
induce Others to act for the same Ends.

The *Second Step* of Mr. *Warburton*, is to shew, That the Legislators “ made the Doctrine of a Providence, with which in *its full extent* they prefaced their Laws, the *grand Sanction* of their Institutions.” Upon Examination, it appears that not *One* of them, not *Zaleucus*, not *Charondas*, not *Cicero* (the only ones whom he has appeal’d to for this Fact,) has done what he says they *all* did. *Moses* has done it as much as any of them; and yet he attempts to prove that *Moses* has never done it.

The *Third Step* is, “ THE Legislator established the grand *Doctrine of a future State of Rewards and Punishments*, by a very particular and popular Method” of inculcating the Belief of such a State, viz. by the *Mysteries*. Who now is meant by THE Legislator? Or what is THE Legislator, unless he speaks of A Legislator, Somebody under that particular Circumstance or Quality. Somebody or other contrived the *Mysteries* in *Egypt*: Some that liked them brought

brought them out of *Egypt*, and propagated them. But were These ALL *Legislators* that did so? No. This is contrary to certain Fact. Does he mean, that ALL *Legislators* inculcated the Belief of a future State of Rewards and Punishments? This is contrary to Fact likewise; at least the Fact has not been proved. Does He argue from this Connection; That They ALL taught the Existence of God, --- therefore Religion --- therefore a *future State*; and that this Connection is necessary? If so, then this will be a conclusive Argument that *Moses* likewise taught a future State: If the Connection be *not necessary*, then how will it be proved that the Other Legislators taught or inculcated a Future State? If then *Moses* has done exactly the same that Other Legislators did, the Demonstration for his Divine Legation from the Medium of no future State, will be equally strong for Them and for Him.

I intended once to have released you here from any further Remarks on the Conduct of the antient Legislators. But I will proceed, and observe, That neither *Triptolemus*, nor *Draco*, nor *Solon*, as far as appears, either *prefaced* their Laws with the Doctrine
of

of a Providence in its full extent; nor can any thing which they have said be construed so as to infer that any of them made the Doctrine of a Providence the *Sanction* of their Laws, or the *grand Sanction* of them, more than *Moses* did. The most that any of them did, was, in general Terms, to command a Reverence to the Gods, or to order in what particular manner they should worship them. e. g. There were these three Laws of *Triptolemus*, the most antient Legislator of the *Athenians*, which *Xenocrates* mentions as remaining at *Eleusis*. Τοὺς τιμᾶν. Θεὸς καρποῖς ἀγάλλειν. Ζέα μὴ σύνεδαι. Honour Parents. Pay worship to the Gods, with the Fruits of the Earth. Do not hurt Animals. *Porphyry* has well observed, (q) that the two first of these are very just and fitting; for we ought to return Good to our Parents, who have been such Benefactors to us; and to pay our First Fruits to the Gods out of those useful Things which they have given us. Of the third there is some Doubt of its Meaning; and St.

(q) Τὰς μὲν ἐν δύο, καλὰς παραδοῦνται. Δεῖ γάρ τὰς μὲν γυναῖς, ἔνεργέτας ἡμῶν γεγενημένους, ἀντευπομένην ἐφ' ὅσουν ἐνδέχεται: τοῖς θεοῖς δὲ, ἀφ' αὐτῶν ἔδωκαν ἡμῖν ὀφελίμων εἰς τὸν βίον ἀπαρχής ποιεῖσθαι. Περὶ δὲ τῆς τρίτου διαπορᾶς, τί πόλες διανοῦνται ὁ Τειπλόλεμος παρῆγεται ἀπέχεισθαι τῶν ζώων. *Porph.* de Abs. li. iv.

Jerom c. Jovinian, l. 2. understands it of not (*r*) *eating Flesh*. Now, is this Mode of Worship, express'd in the Manner that This is by *Triptolemus*, any Sanction, or designed as a *Sanction* to his Laws? Or can you perceive in these Words any Thing about a Providence in its *full Extent*? *Solon* does not seem to have done so much as *Triptolemus* or *Draco* did: We know of no *Introduction* to his Laws, about a Providence, whether in its *full Extent* or not: And Mr. *Warburton* only tells us, that He *provided for the due and regular Celebration of the Mysteries*, p. 107. When *Solon* had made his Laws, (*s*) all *Draco's* Laws ceased to be observed, *except only what related to Murder*; as *Ælian* assures us: and consequently, if *Draco* did make a Law to honour the Gods in such a particular Manner, and declared it to be *perpetual*, *ἀνέπιος*, yet at this Time it ceased to be in Use.

But *Solon* provided for the *regular Celebration of the Mysteries*. Granting this:

(*r*) Xenocrates Philosophus de Triptolemi legibus apud Athenienfes tria tantum præcepta in templo Eleufinæ residere scribit: Honorandos Parentes; venerandos Deos; carnibus non vescendum. Hieron. adv. Jovinian. l. 2.

(*s*) Καὶ τότε ἐπαύσαντο Αθηναῖοι χράμενοι τοῖς Δράκοντος — μόνης δὲ ἐφύλαξαν τὰς φονικὰς ἀυλὰς. *Ælian.* l. viii. c. 10.

What

What is this to the making the Doctrine of a Providence in its full Extent, either a *Preface* to, or the *grand Sanction* of his LAWS? The making a Body of Institutions is one Thing : the Provision for a due and regular Celebration of the Mysteries is another : And how “considerable a Part soever of *Divine Worship* these were,” or of what “Importance soever to the very Essence of Religion,” yet these were not Prefaces to LAWS, nor declared to be the *grand Sanctions* of them.

To go still higher. *Minos* pretended to an Intercourse with *Jupiter*, and he consulted him (*t*) every ninth Year, as *Homer* tells us. This Legislator, designing to correct and amend what was faulty or defective in his Institutions, was wont to retire into a Cave at the End of eight Years, and then pretended there to have had a Conversation with *Jupiter*. The Reason of this Pretence, (*u*) *Plato* has truly given us ; not to procure by the Influence of any Notion of a Providence in its full Extent, an Ob-

Mīnos

(*t*) Ἐγγίαρος βασίλευε διὸς μεγάλες ὁμηρίαις. Hom. Od. τ. 179.

(*u*) Ως πάντα καλῶς κένται, Σέντων θεῶν. Plato de legib. l. i. p. 635.

ervation of the Laws, but that *all Laws* were right and good since the Gods gave them. I would here ask, Was there any *Preface* to his Laws? Or if there was, did it contain the Doctrine of a Providence in its *full Extent*? The Point is not, what any of these Legislators *thought* themselves about a future State: for *Moses* is acknowledged to believe such a State, as much as *Minos*, or *Triptolemus*, or *Draco*: But, what did *Minos* make the *Introduction* to, or the *grand Sanction* of his *Laws*? It is allowed, that some of the antient Legislators ordered or commanded a Worship or Reverence of the Gods: That ALL did even That, is more, I think, than can be proved. However *Moses* has done it vastly more, and more particularly, than any of them ever did, or perhaps than all of them put together. Mr. *Warburton* therefore should not take it for granted, that ALL these Legislators *prefaced* their Institutions with the Doctrine of a Providence in its *full Extent*; and less should he do this in a Demonstration; when he knows, that neither their *Laws*, nor the *Prefaces* to them (if ever they had any) are

are extant, nor has any Body told what they contained.

But let us suppose, that Mr. Warburton is able to prove his Assertions to be true of *Triptolemus*, *Draea*, *Solon*, *Zaleucus* and *Charondas*, and many others,— that all these prefaced their Laws with the Doctrine of a Providence in its *full Extent*; yet before his *Demonstration* will be compleat and satisfactory, He must shew the same of *Zalmoxis*, *Zathraustus*, *Lycaon*, and ALL the rest of the Tribe of Legislators, whose Names we know, and nothing else. It is an easy Thing to say, that “there never was, in any Age of the World, from the most early Accounts of Time to this present Hour, any civil, polish'd Nation or People, who had a Religion, of which the chief Foundation and Support was not the Doctrine of a future State of Rewards and Punishments.” p. 86.. Be it granted: The Question now is,— Whether ALL Legislators have in their *Laws*, or in their *Prefaces* to them, urged this Doctrine as a Motive to the People to observe their Laws? Have they *All* laid it down as a Principle, that the Gods would punish the refractory

and disobedient, either here or *bereafter*? Have they *All* urged upon the People the Notion of a Providence in its full Extent? No. Mr. Warburton has not instanced in one that has done it *expressly*. But instead of this, a *Consequence* is drawn from the bare mention of the *Gods*, either in the *Laws* themselves of some, or in the Prefaces of Others; even where the Legislator has expressly confined his Thought to a *present* Interposition of Providence for the *present Safety and Security* of the People.

But you will say perhaps, that the Connexion stands thus. Wherever there was a *Worship* of the *Gods*, there was a *Religion*: Wherever there was *Religion*, the chief Foundation and Support of that was the Doctrine of a future State of Rewards and Punishments, except only among the *Jewish* People: And therefore if any Legislator commanded the *Worship* of the *Gods*, That was enough to shew, that a Providence in *its full Extent* was made, or taught, as the *grand Sanction* of their *Laws*.

I am not now enquiring into a Point of *Reason*, but into a Matter of *Fact*: How far the old Legislators did *in Fact* inculcate the

the Notion of a Providence in its *full Extent* in their *Laws*, or in the *Introductions* to them. Now *Zaleucus* and *Charondas*, (and for ought that appears to the contrary, all the rest) extended their Notions of a Providence in their Laws, or Prefaces, only to the *present Safety* of their People. Their avenging Dæmons executed only a *present Punishment*, according to their Laws, or the Preambles to them; and it is more natural to believe, that the Sanctions of Laws, which are the positive Commands or Prohibitions of a temporal Superior, should be such as a temporal Superior could put in Execution. Here therefore Mr. *Warburton* should have been full in his *Proofs*, and not have put his Reader off with a Sentence of Mr. *Bayle*, *That all the Religions of the World, true or false, turn upon this Point, that there is a Judge invisible, who punishes or rewards after this Life, both the internal and external Actions of Men.* p. 87.

My first Remark on these Words of Mr. *Bayle* is, That He makes no *Exception* for the *Jewish People*, as Mr. *Warburton* has,

My second is, That supposing it to be true, that *ALL Religions* turn upon this,

that there is a future State of Rewards and Punishments, yet ALL Legislators may not from thence imagine, that *their* Laws have, or ought to have, the grand Sanction of a future State of Rewards and Punishments to enforce Obedience. And

Thirdly, If some of the Legislators should have made a Providence in its full Extent, the grand Sanction of their Laws ; *Others* might not consider a Providence in its full Extent necessary to secure Obedience from their People ; but only a Providence extending to Civil Affairs.

When Mr. *Warburton* immediately adds, that Mr. *Bayle*, “ thinks, that it was the “ Utility of that Doctrine, which set the “ Magistrate upon inventing a Religion for “ the State.” p. 87. I cannot but take Notice, that Mr. *Bayle* has said no such Thing ; neither about the *Magistrate* ; nor his *inventing a Religion* ; nor his inventing it *for the State* ; nor its *Utility to the State*. But do you consult his Article of *Spinosa* refer’d to : R E M. E. I return to my Subject.

We know more of the old *Roman Law* and Legislators, than we do of any other

Nation

Nation of the World, except the *Jews*. The Laws of *Romulus* and *Numa* concerning sacred Things were not a few ; and Both of Those Kings thought it right to impress and fix a Notion of *Religion* upon that rude, uncivilized, fierce People. *Romulus* order'd, that no public Business should be done without consulting the *Auspices*; that sacred Affairs should be managed or transacted only by such certain Persons; that no one should give into any fabulous Stories of the Gods; that they should not worship any foreign Deities, *Faunus* excepted, &c. But not a Word appears of a *future State* of Rewards and Punishments, or a Providence in its full Extent in all these Laws; nor did He make any *Preface* of that Kind to them. *Numa*, as much as he concerned himself about *Religious* Matters, did not make any *Introduction* to his Laws about a Providence in its full Extent. He appointed a *Flamen Dialis*; *Martialis*, *Quirinalis*, a *Pontifex maximus*, four *Vestal* Virgins, the *Salii*, and other sacred Persons. But as to the Doctrine of Providence, he left it as it was; and put no *Preface* about it, as far as appears, to his Laws; nor did he

he enforce Obedience to them by denouncing Punishments in a future Life. All that he intended or designed was only to teach the People, that (*x*) *the Gods took Notice of human Affairs*, and concerned themselves with them at *present*.

If we go on to the Laws of the XII Tables, which were principally taken from the Laws of Solon.--- The *eight first* Tables contained the Laws about Private Right, the *Ninth* contained what related to Public Right : The *Tenth* was about *Sacred Right*. In this one might expect to find, if any where, the Doctrine of a Providence made the Sanction of these Laws. But instead of that, I do not so much as find the Word, *Gods*, or *Providence*, or any Thing that implied any Notion of them in all that remains of the XII Tables ; unless you can infer any thing from the Word, *Oath* : And let me observe, the *Roman Lawyers* say, (*y*) *The Punishment of Perjury from the Gods was DESTRUCTION, from Man Ignominy and Disgrace.*

(*x*) *Deos interesse rebus humanis.* Liv. 1. 1.

Quod autem non Judex, sed Deus ipse vindicta constituitur,
Præsentis pœnae metu religio confirmari videtur. Cic. de Leg. 1. 2.

(*y*) *Perjurii pœna divina exitium, humana dedecus.* *ibid.*

Mosæ

Moses is then upon the same Footing at least with all these antient Legislators: His Notions of a Providence are as extenſive as theirs: His Words ought in common Justice to be conſtruēd as extenſively as theirs; or their Words reduced to the Extent of his. And if the bare Omission of a future State in any Body of Institutes be ſufficient to prove the Divine Legation of ſuch Legiſlator, Do you judge how many of the antient Legiſlators will have a Claim to a Divine Miſſion as well as *Moses*.

Thus much for the Conduēt of Legiſlators and Inſtitutors of Civil Society. I ſhall next conſider what Mr. Warburton has offer'd about "the Opinions of all the Learners and Teachers of Wiſdom in the Schools of antient Philosophy." p. 86.

I do not deſign by this to examine at large what he has offered upon this Head, but I ſhall confine myſelf principally to what He himſelf thinks may be deemed an "unreasonable and licentious Paradox," concerning the *Double Doctrine* of the antient *Philofophers*: In which I think him

as

76 *The DOUBLE DOCTRINE of*
as much mistaken as he was in the Con-
duct of the antient Legislators.

That the Force of what I shall say on
this Head may be the better seen. I shall

First lay down what the Antients them-
selves have said about the *Double Doctrine*,
and shew how they understood their own
Language and Practice; and shall enquire
whether what they did is sufficient to jus-
tify their Use of an Esoteric and Exoteric
Teaching. And then I will examine the
Reasons given by Mr. Warburton for his *new*
Notion. If you see that the Antients de-
liver'd their Sentiments consistently and ra-
tionally, and that Mr. Warburton has not
made out his new Notion, I persuade my-
self that you will see no Reason in any
great Haste to follow this new Light into
the Province of Paradox.

I must observe, First, That ἀκοῆς is pro-
perly a *Hearer*; and thence it is put for a
Disciple, or one that goes to any one as a
Master to be taught by him; and the *learn-*
ing is called ἀκέρασις. *Auditio*. Now these
Hearers or Disciples were of two Sorts,
Those who came to the Teacher as Scholars
and paid for their Learning; and those that
were

were ἔξωφενται, i. e. All such as resorted to hear any Public Lectures; and these were distinguished from the Scholars properly so called. This gave occasion for such Expressions as these, ἔξωφενται λόγοι, ἔξωφενται ἀκρόασις, *exoteric Auditio, exoteric Discourses, exoteric Hearing or Learning,* which were such Lectures as were read to all promiscuously that came to hear them.

That the ἔξωφενται λόγοι, *exoteric Speeches, or Discourses,* were such Lectures, appears from *Andronicus*, the Paraphrast of Aristotle's Ethics ad Nicomachum. Aristotle himself had said, λέγεται πεῖται δύτης [Φυχῆς] οὐ εἰς ἔξωφενταις λόγοις αἴρεταις ἔνται, οὐ χρηστάναι δύτοις. *Andronicus* paraphrases this thus ---- Ήσή τοι Φυχῆς & μάνον εἰς συγγράμμασιν, ἀλλὰ καὶ στὸ σύμματος πρὸς τὰς ἐντυγχάνωντας, αἴρεταις εἴπομεν ἔνται. Aristotle's Words are --- *We have said some things concerning the Soul in our Exoteric Discourses:* *Andronicus's Paraphrase is,--We have said some things concerning the Soul not only in our Writings, or set Discourses, but in what was delivered viva voce, to all that happened to COME TO HEAR us.* So that in *Andronicus's Notion*, ἔξωφενται λόγοι, or *Exoteric Discourses*, were committed to *Writing*, as well as delivered *viva voce;*

78 *The DOUBLE DOCTRINE of
voce; and then were called ἔξωτερα συγγράμ-
ματα, Exoteric Writings.*

The *Exoteric*, λόγοι, *Discourses*, were spoken to those that were οἱ ἔξω, *Strangers*, i. e.: not professed Scholars or Disciples; to all ἐντυγχάνοντας, all that chanced to give their Attendance upon the Lecture. The *Exoteric* συγγράμματα, *Writings*, were the same Lectures put into Writing, and in course suited to the Hearers.

2. As *ἀρροτής* was properly a Disciple or Scholar, so what was read to such was called *Acroatic*, and from the *privateness* of the Lecture, it was called *Esoteric*: i. e. a Lesson or Discourse read to those that were ἕσω. For *Acroatic* and *Esoteric* are the same: both opposed to the Discourses read τοῖς ἔξω, to those without, i. e. to those that were not Disciples, who paid for their learning. Therefore (z) Clemens Alexandrinus makes, *Exoteric*, and *Common*, the *Same*. Strom. 1. 5. which shews how He understood the Word *Exoteric*. Whatever then Aristotle read or discoursed to any, or all that came to him in the *Evening* as he walked in the *Lycæum*, be it on what Subject he would,

(z) Ταῦτα ἔξωτερα καὶ κοινὰ. Clem. Alex. Stro. 1. v.

it was an *Exoteric*; not that he did not believe every thing that he there said; but it was a Doctrine that he taught ἐξωτερικοῖς to all that came to bear him. And if these *Exoteric* Discourses were read to his *Scholars*, whom he taught in the Morning, they were then *acroatic* Discourses or Lectures.

3. As there were ἐξωτερικοὶ λόγοι, and συγχρήματα, *Exoteric Discourses and Writings*, so likewise, there were ἀκροατικοὶ λόγοι and ἀκροατικὰ συγγράμματα. This appears from *Alexander's Letter to Aristotle*, and *Aristotle's Answer to him*, which I shall cite by and by. These were Discourses read in private to the Scholars, and are the same with *Esoterics*. These were either *viva voce* Lectures read to them, or Writings upon any Subjects, well considered, polished, finished; which went to the bottom of the Subject: and therefore in many cases fit only for such as had Abilities, or had made a Progress sufficient to comprehend them.

The *First Reason* then of the Distinction between *Exoteric* and *Esoteric* Doctrines was taken from the *Persons* to whom they were read: the *Exoteric* being read to all that happened

78 *The DOUBLE DOCTRINE of*
happened to attend them, the *Acroatic* only
to proper Scholars.

A Second Reason was taken from the *Matter* treated of in these Discourses. *Aulus Gellius* is very particular as to this Point. (*a*) “ By *Exoterics*, ” says he, “ they meant such Discourses as related to *Rhetoric*, the *Art*, or *Faculty*, of speaking acutely, and the *Knowledge of Civil Affairs*. *Acroatics* were called such Discourses in which the more profound and subtle Philosophy was concerned ; such as related to the Contemplations of Nature, and Dialectical Disputes.”

When he had thus defined these Words from the *Matter*, or *Subject* of them, he goes on to shew the Difference of *Acroatic* and *Exoteric* from the *Persons* as I before explain’d it. *Aristotle* says he, (*b*) “ did not indifferently admit every Body to his

(*a*) Εξωτερικαὶ dicebantur quæ ad Rheticas meditationes, facultatem argutiarum, Civiliumque rerum notitiam conducebant. Ἀκροατικὰ vocabantur in quibus Philosophia remotior subtiliorque agitabatur, quæque ad naturæ contemplationes disceptationesque Dialecticas pertinebant. *Gellius*. l. xx.

c. 5.

(*b*) Nec ad eam [viz. ἀκρατικὴν] quemquam temerè mittebat, nisi quoniam ante ingenium et eruditio[n]is elementa atque in discendo studium labore[m]que explorasset. Illas vero ἐξωτερικὰ auditio[n]es—vulgo Juvenibus sine delectu præbēbat. *Ibid.*

Acroatic

" *Acroatic Lectures*, but only such whose
 " Learning, Industry and Application to
 " Study He had tried and well knew. But
 " his *Exoteric Lectures* he publicly and
 " openly read to young Men without any
 " Distinction."

A Third Difference observed by *Gellius* between the two Sorts of Doctrines is, that
 (c) " the *Exoterics* were Lectures read in
 " the *Evening*; the *Acroatics* were read in
 " the *Morning.*" And *Aristotle* so divided
 his Books into these Sorts, that some of
 them were called *Exoterics*, others *Acroatics*.

There may seem to some, a difference between the *Exoteric* and *Acroatic* Doctrine taken from the *Manner* in which the Books were wrote. *Tully* has made a Remark, which may seem to lead to this, though in reality it does not. His Words are (d) ---
 " There are two Sorts of Books concerning
 " the *Summum Bonum*, the One wrote in a
 " popular Manner which they call *Exoteric*,

(c) Ἐξωτερικὰς auditiones exercitiūnque dicendi—vesperi faciebat, atque eum δειλινὸν περίπατον appellabat, illum alterum suprà ἐωθινόν ibid. Pomeridianis Scholis Aristoteles præcipere Artem oratoriam cœpit. Quintil. l. 3. c. 1.

(d) De summo autem bono, quia duo Genera librorum sunt, unum populariter scriptum, quod ἔξωτερικὸν appellabant, alterum limatius quod in commentariis reliquerunt, non semper idem dicere videntur. Cic. de finibus, l. 5.

" the Other more accurate and finished,
" which they left in their *Commentaries*:
" And in these they do not seem always to
" say the same." It is certain that *Aristotle*
wrote in *Commentaries* both his *Exoteric* and
Acroatic Discourses: " *Librosque suos earum*
" *omnium rerum Commentarios, seorsim di-*
" *visit; ut alii Exoterici dicerentur, partim*
" *Acroatici,*" says *Gellius*. Does *Cicero* mean
then, that the *popularly wrote* Treatises were
called *Exoterics*, and those that were *more*
polished or accurate only were left in Books
and call'd *Esoterics*? This can't be, be-
cause we have *Exoteric* Discourses, such as
those in which *Aristotle* treated about the
Soul, which himself expressly calls *Exoteric*,
left in Books. *Cicero* I think, seems to mean,
that there were two Sorts of written Treati-
ses or Discourses. One *popular*, containing
the *Exoteric* Lectures, wrote in a plain, dif-
fuse, copious Manner, suited to common
Capacities and what every Body could ap-
prehend: The Other Sort of Lectures was
" wrote with *Accuracy*" and Care and Con-
ciseness, suited more to those (*e*) who had Parts

(e) *Quorum ingenium et eruditionis elementa atque in dif-
cendo studium laboreisque explorasset.* *Gellius.*

and Learning, and who were willing to Study and to take Pains. These latter Treatises were not usually *Exoteric*: but yet they might be so, if they were read to Persons abroad, at the Evening Lecture. Now Cicero here mentions only *Exoteric* Treatises, whether popularly or more accurately wrote concerning the *summum bonum*, in which there was not the Consistency he desired: and has not mentioned the Other, or the *Acroatic* Treatises at all. This I take to be his meaning: But let it be what it will, there is no hint that the *Exoteric* contained a Doctrine *not believed* by its Author: Nor can his Word, *limatus*, *more polished*, *more accurate*, signify any thing more than that he wrote in a more exact and finished manner what he said upon that Subject.

The Difference between the *Exoteric* and *Esoteric* Doctrines being thus founded on the Persons, Subjects, Times, and perhaps the Manner of Writing; I must observe further,

That we have extant a Letter of Alexander's to Aristotle, and Aristotle's Answer; in both which, mention is made of the *ἀκροάται λόγοι*, or Acroatic Discourses. (f) *Alexander*

(f) Οὐκ ἐθέλεις ἐποίησας, ἐκδὺς τὸς ἀκροάταις τῶν λόγων.
Τίνι γὰρ ἔτι διοίστατε ἡμεῖς τῶν ἀλλαρινῶν, εἰ καθ' οὓς ἐπα-

writes to him a Reprof, that he had published his *Acroatic Discourses* or Doctrines, *those in which he had been instructed by him*; and asks, *Wherein should he excell others, if the Notions which he had received from him were now common to all?* And he adds, *that he had rather excell others in Knowledge of the best Things, than in Arms.*

Aristotle's Acroatics then contained the things in which he instructed young *Alexander*; and which his Pupil, in the midst of his Victories and great Successes, and grown riper in Judgment, deemed unfit to be published, because, *if the Knowledge of them were COMMON to all, he should have no particular Advantage in that Respect over others.* He owns that he was indebted to these *Acroatics* for the Knowledge or Skill in the BEST things. *Plutarch* will explain this: For speaking of these very Letters, he tells us, (g) that *Aristotle taught Alexander "the Secret and weightier Instructions which Men peculiarly style Acroamatic and Epop-*

δεύθημεν λόγος ἐτοι πάντων ἔσονται κοινοί; Ἐγὼ δὲ βελούμην ἀν ταῦς πεὶ τὰ ἀριστα ἐμπειρίας, οὐ ταῦς δυνάμεστοι φέρειν. *Gellius.* I. xx. c. 5.

(g) Τῶν ὑπορρήτων καὶ εἰρηνέων διδασκαλιῶν, ὃς ὁ ἀνδρεῖς ἴδιας ἀκροαματικὸς καὶ ἐποπλικὸς προσαγορεύοντες, καὶ ἔχερεσσον τις πολλάς. *Plut. Alex.* p. 668.

"tic, and which they do not publish to all the World." Are not these secret and weightier, or more momentous *Instructions*, the very Depths, the full and whole that the Master knew on any Subject? They are in matters of Philosophy what Gellius calls, (*b*) *the more deep and subtle Philosophy*. Plutarch fays, that *Alexander* wrote to *Aristotle* ὑπὲ φιλοσοφίας, in behalf of or about *Philosophy*: and he plainly understands by this *Aristotle's Metaphysics*. He expresses himself indeed, as *Plutarch* too often does, so obscurely, that it may be hard to fix the exact meaning of every Word: However it is easy to see what is *not* his meaning. It is *not* any thing relating to *believing* or *not believing* the Doctrine taught, which distinguished the *Exoteric* from the *Acroatic*. His Words are, (*i*) *For in Truth the Affair of Metaphysics, (containing nothing useful either to [common] teaching or learning) was wrote as a short Specimen or System for those who had been instructed from the Beginning.* As they were wrote therefore in this manner, for the Use

(*b*) *Philosophia remotior subtiliorque.* *Gellius* supra.

(*i*) Αληθῶς γάρ οὐ μεταφυσικὴ πρᾶγματεία πρὸς διδασ-
καλίαν καὶ μαθησιν εἰδὲν ἔχουσα χρήσιμον, ναόδηγμα τοῖς
πεπαιδευμένοις απ' αὐχῆς γέγραπται. *Plut. Alex.*

86 The DOUBLE DOCTRINE of

of those who had been instructed already by him, and only for those; He might justly answer *Alexander*, that his (*k*) Acroatics were published and not published, because they were not intelligible, except to those only who had heard him. *Plutarch* commends in the same place, *Alexander's* (*l*) innate Zeal for and desire of Philosophy nursed up with him from the beginning: which seems to intimate that the Philosophy taught him by *Aristotle* was the thing which so greatly distinguished him from others. He mentions likewise that he learnt *Ethics* and *Politics* from *Aristotle*: and he was wont to pay his grateful Acknowledgments to his Master, even preferring him to his Father, to whom he was indebted that he lived, but to the Other, that he was enabled to live well.

But be the Acroatics either Physics or Metaphysics, be they Ethical or Political Discourses, it is plain that *Plutarch* was in the same Sentiments about them that *Gellius* was, that they were Doctrines profound, deep, subtle, weighty, fit for such as had been already

(*k*) Ἡδὲ αὐτὸς καὶ σκληρομένες καὶ μὴ σκληρομένες. Συνιστοῦνται εἰσι μόνοις τοῖς ἡμῶν διάστασιν. *Gellius*. *Plut.*

(*l*) Πρέστι φιλοσοφίαν ἐμπερινώς καὶ συνθετικάμενος ἀπ' αρχῆς αὐτῷ ζῆλος καὶ πόθος. *Ibid.*

instructed in them. It is certain they were Doctrines committed to a young *Pupil*, which therefore one may be sure, were not Doctrines which related to the *Non-belief of God or the Gods*, or to the Non-existence of the Soul in a proper State of Rewards or Punishments. But further,

It is well enough known how zealous the Fathers of the Church were against the Heathens; they charged them with every Thing that could make the World have a light Esteem for them, or their Notions. Now what a noble Field would here have been open'd, could they have charged their Sages and Philosophers with the Diffimulation, which Mr. *Warburton* has here done? Could they have loaded them with the Crime of *believing one Thing, and teaching another*, with *Lying*, with imposing on the Credulity of the People; what a Display of Rhetoric should we have had? Could there have been a more fit Occasion for Satire, or for Declamation, than what such Conduct would have afforded? They knew of the *double Doctrine*; but they were so far from imagining, that *Plato* or *Aristotle*, &c. were guilty of any Crime, or deserved

any Blame, that they never reproach them on that Account; nay, they justify their Use of the *Esoteric* and *Exoteric* Doctrines. They were so far from thinking that they deserved any Censure for their Manner of teaching, that *Clemens* puts *Moses*, and the *Egyptians*, and the *Philosophers*; upon a Level in this Respect, and applauds the Wisdom of them all for covering their Doctrines with Veils, which the common People could not see thro'. He urges the common Practice of both Sacred and Profane Writers to involve their religious Nations in Obscurity: and he produces several Reasons in Justification of that Practice. He shews, that *Moses* had a deep and mystical View in the Contrivance of the Apparatus of the Tabernacle; and the Apostles too concealed the *Mysteries* of the Christian Faith. And whilst he was setting out these Things at large, he mentions the ἀπόρρητα, the *Secrets* of the Philosophers, and their *double Doctrines*. (m) Not only the Pythagoreans,

(m) Οὐ μόνοι ἄρα οἱ Πυθαγόρειοι καὶ Πλάτων τὰ πολλὰ ἐπεκρύπτοντο, ἀλλὰ καὶ οἱ Ἐπικρύπτοι φασὶ τινα καὶ παῖς αὐτοῖς ΑΠΟΡΡΗΤΑ ἔνας, καὶ μὴ πέσσιν ἐπιτρέπεται ἐντυγχάνειν τὰς τοις ὑρέθημασιν. Αλλὰ καὶ Σζωικοὶ λέγουσι Ζήνωνες τῷ πρώτῳ γνιγάρδαι τινα, ἀμφὶ παῖδισς ἐπιτρέπεσσι τοῖς μαθηταῖς

reans, and Plato, says he, hid many Things, but the Epicureans too say, that They have their Secrets, and do not permit every Body to peruse those Writings. The Stoicks too tell us, that some Things were wrote by Zeno the First, which they do not suffer their Disciples easily to read, unless they have first given Proof, that they are of a true philosophic Turn, or Disposition. The Followers of Aristotle too say, that some of their Doctrines are Esoteric, others are Common and Exoteric. They also that instituted the Mysteries, being PHILOSOPHERS [not LEGISLATORS, Mr. Warburton on the contrary says, they were LEGISLATORS, not PHILOSOPHERS] covered over their Opinions with Fables, that they might not be open or manifest to all.

The Design of Clemens was to justify this Method of concealing Notions from the profane and unworthy ; but he never hints at the Philosophers *not believing* what was either covered, or concealed, or expressed by Symbols, and in Allegory, or what was

μαθηταῖς ἀναγνώσκειν, μὴ δύχι πεῖσαι δεδωκόσι πρόλεξον, τέ γυντίως φιλοτοροῖεν. Λέγετο δὲ καὶ οἱ Αριστότελοι, τὰ μὲν ἐσωτερικὰ ἔναι τῶν συγβαμμάτων εὐτέ, τὰ δὲ κοινά τε καὶ ἐξωτερικά. Άλλα καὶ οἱ τὰ μυστήρια θέμενοι, φιλόσοφοι δέλτες, τὰ διπλῶν δόγματα τοῖς μύθοις κατέχυσαν, ὡςε μὴ ἔναι πᾶσι δῆλα. Clem. Alex. Strom. I. 5. p. 680, 681.

90 The DOUBLE DOCTRINE of

common and exoteric, or laid before the People. He goes on in a very remarkable Passage to observe, (*n*) that neither the Pythagorean Fables, nor what Plato says in his Republic concerning Armenius, nor in his Gorgias concerning Æacus and Rhadamanthus, nor in his Phædon concerning Tartarus, nor in his Protagoras concerning Prometheus and Epimetheus, nor what he says of the War between the Atlantines and Athenians in the Atlantic Sea. ---- These, says he, are not to be allegorized, as to every Word, but only such Words as are declarative of the general Sentiments. He supposes the Things signified by those Words to be really true, and to be believed, tho' they were covered over with Symbolical, or Mystical, or Allegorical Veils; and that under those Veils, and by such Terms, a real, believed Truth was intended. And hence it is that he makes the

(n) οὐδὲ οἱ μῆθοι οἱ Πυθαγόρειοι, ἀλλὰ καὶ οἱ παρότι Πλάτωνι, ἐν Πολιτείᾳ πρὸς τὴν Αρμενίην, καὶ ἐν Γοργίᾳ Ἀιάκῳ καὶ Ραδαμάνθυῳ, καὶ ἐν Φαιδρῷ ὁ τὸ Ταξίδεων, καὶ ἐν Πρωταγόρᾳ ὁ Περιμνήσως καὶ Επιμνήσως. Περὶ δὲ τοῖς, ὃ τῷ πελέμῳ τῶν Ατλαντικῶν καὶ τῶν Αθηναίων ἐν τῷ Ατλαντικῷ, ἀλλὰ ἀπλᾶς καὶ λαταρία τὰ ἐνόματα ἀλληγορητέοι, ἀλλ' ὅσα τῆς διανύσσεται τῆς καθόλου σηματικά καὶ διὰ ταῦτα ἐξει- μενά διὰ συμβόλων ὥστε παρεκκαλύμματι τῇ αἰλιηγοειδεῖ μηνινθεντα. Clem. Alex. St. 5.

true Distinction of the double Doctrine to be, that (o) *the one was spoken out clearly, the other was covered from the many.*

From these Remarks upon the double Doctrine it plainly appears, that the Antients were perfect Strangers to even the Suspicion of that which Mr. Warburton calls his “New Opinion.” Vol. I. p. 351. The Practice of the double Doctrine was a Thing well known, and much approved by them: But to suppose it to consist in speaking what was *not believed*, was as far from *their* Thoughts, as it was from every Bodies else, when Mr. Warburton first discovered this Secret.

You’ll tell me perhaps, that it is nothing to the Purpose to enquire what Notions the Antients had about the *double Doctrine*: That Mr. Warburton owns his Opinion to be “New;” and therefore that it is lost Labour to search in Antiquity for what has been all along mistaken, or misunderstood.

But this is the very Thing, which shews how unreasonable and “licentious his Para-

(o) Τὸ μὲν φᾶσαι, τὸ δὲ κεκρυμμένον ἔνας πεῖσ τὸς πολλούς. Clem. ibid.

dox" is ; it is in Effect to maintain that the Antients did not understand their own Words, or their own Practices. He has not produced one Passage that directly proves his Point ; but he has first invented an Hypothesis about the double Doctrine ; and then He tries to accommodate his Schemes to that. Is there one express Passage, which proves, that the *Exoteric* Doctrines were not *believed*? Is it not by Way of *Consequence* only, that this *Disbelief* of what they openly taught is charged upon them ? Has he produced any Passages from *Plato*, or *Aristotle*, or any of those who used the Distinction of *Esoteric* and *Exoteric*, which come up to his Point ? He has indeed found out a Distinction betwixt what *Plato's* Words are, and what he makes *Socrates* say, in order to establish his Point, that *Plato* did not *believe*, tho' he *profess'd*, a future State of Rewards and Punishments. *Remarks.* p. 65. But this Distinction was as much unknown to the Antients as his Paradox itself was. They tell us, that he (p) gave us his

(p) Πεὶ μὲν τὸν αὐτῷ δοκέντων ἀποδίνειαν διὰ τετγίδων περσώπων, Σωκράτες, Τιμᾶς, Εtc. ἐπεὶ καὶ τὰ Σωκράτες καὶ τὰ Τιμᾶς λέγων Πλάτων δογματίζει. Diog. Laert. vita Platonis.

own Sentiments under the Persons of Socrates, Timæus, &c. And take away what Socrates, Timæus, the Athenian Stranger, and the Eleatic Stranger say, there will remain but little in Comparison, from whence one can learn *Plato's Opinions*. But to return to what I was observing about the Doctrine of *Plato*.

The Works of *Plato* were never distinguished by himself, or any other, into the two general Classes of Esoterics and Exoterics. The grand Distinction of them was into other general Heads, which again were subdivided into the *Physical*, under which was ranged *Timæus*: *Logical*; under which Head was placed, *Politicus*, *Cratylus*, *Parmenides*, *Sophistes*. *Ethical*; under which was put his *Apology*, *Criton*, *Phædon*, *Phædrus*, *Symposium*, *Menexenus*, *Clitophon*, *Epistles*, *Philebus*, *Hipparchus*, *Anterastæ*. *Political*; under which Head were his Books of *Republic*, *Laws*, *Minos*, *Epinomis*, *Atlanticus*. *Maieutic*; which contains *Alcibiades*, *Theages*, *Lysis*, and *Laches*. *Piraistic*, or what was wrote to try to confound the Arrogance of others; such were *Euthyphron*, *Menon*, *Ion*, *Charmides*, *Theætetus*. *Demonstrative*;

monstrative; which has the *Protagoras*. And last of all the *Subversive*; in which the Business was to confute and subvert any Notions; and in this Class were *Euthydemus*, the Two *Hippias's*, and the *Gorgias*. This is the Division of them in *Diogenes Laertius*: And there is the very same Division of them by *Albinus*: Only this last Author has placed some of the particular Treatises under a different, general Head. But Both of them place the *Gorgias* under the Class of *Subversive*, as it ought to be, it being design'd to confute the Sophists about their false Use of *Rhetoric*. Neither of these Writers ever thought of such a Notion, or such a Division, as of Books, which contained what *Plato taught*, and did not believe, and what he taught, and did believe. A Distinction! which could not but have naturally occurr'd, had such a Notion been then known, or heard of, or had it been the reputed Meaning of *Esoterics* and *Exoterics*. The *Gorgias* then of *Plato* may be deem'd an *Exoteric Book*, because it contained a Discourse upon the Subject of *Rhetoric*, and the true and false Use of that Art: But not because it detailed out the Doctrine

Doctrine of a future State of Rewards and Punishments of which *Plato* believed nothing himself, tho' he taught it others as seriously as if he had believed it. It may not be amiss,

Lastly, to observe that *Speusippus*, the Disciple of *Plato*, first published what *Iso-*
crates called τὰ ἀπόρρητα. These Secrets were nothing but what *Isocrates* made a great Secret of; not what he did not believe, but what he did believe, and kept as a great Secret to himself, which was the Art of turning a Period rightly. He was in high Credit, and followed by the most illustrious Scholars in *Athens*, where he taught Eloquence with the greatest Success and Admiration; and as he had made particular Observations on the Manner and Art of Speaking, --- These were what He kept as Secrets, and were what *Speusippus* published. v. *Laertius* in *Speusippum*, and the Commentators on that Place in *Menagius's* Edition.

From these Things I would observe,

i. Supposing these old Philosophers to be Legislators, and to have had in View the public Utility. Nothing appears from what the
Antients

Antients have said (and we find the Word often used by them) that by *Exoterics*, were meant Doctrines, which those, who taught them, did *not believe*. Exoterics were Doctrines read to the Vulgar, and suited to vulgar *Capacities*, or the common Ideas which the Vulgar had. Supposing then, that the Philosophers made use, in those Discourses, of Parables, or Fables, or Allegories; --- This was done in order to represent Things so as the People could best apprehend them; and this Manner of teaching ought not to be treated as *Lying*, or as not believing the *Things* which they taught. When any one uses a *Parable*, in order to convey his Sentiments, --- is he to be charged with teaching what he does not believe? How will such a Notion agree with the Manner of teaching in the New Testament? *Macrobius* (*q*) (whose Words I shall have Occasion to consider by and by) has wrote a particular Chapter to enquire, what *Fables* Philosophy may allow of or admit, and upon what Occasions Philosophers are wont

(*q*) *Quid respondendum Coloti Epicureo, putanti philosopho non esse utendum fabulis: quasque fabulas philosophia recipiat, et quando his Philosophi soleant uti.* *Macrob. in Som. Scip. c. 2.*

to use them. He there mentions the Cases in which he thinks it *lawful* and right to use *Fable*: and what he has said on that Head is applicable to other Manners of conveying Instruction to the common People.

Mr. *Toland* has made another Use of the double Doctrine than what Mr. *Warburton* has, and has run into a very different Extreme. He says, that the Philosophers were "constrained by the *Holy Tyranny of the Priests* to make use of a twofold Doctrine, the one *popular*, accommodated to the PREJUDICES of the Vulgar, and to the received Customs or Religions; the other *philosophical*, conformable to the Nature of Things, and consequently to Truth, which, with *Doors fast shut*, and under all other Precautions they communicated only to Friends of known Probability, Prudence and Capacity. These, says he, they generally called the *Exoteric and Esoteric*, or the *External and Internal Doctrines*." *Toland's Tetrady mus*, p. 66. Mr. *Toland* had as much Right to invent this Hypothesis, which has not one Word in Antiquity to support it, as Mr.

Warburton has for his Paradox, which is equally groundless. That which confutes his Notion is, that the *Esoteric* Lectures were read in the Morning to their Scholars and to those only; the *Exoterics*, or popular ones, were read in the Evening: nor was the *Exoteric* Doctrine accommodated to the *Prejudices* of the Vulgar, but to the *Capacities* of them.

2. Be it granted, that the Philosophers had in View the Public Good, and that they talked *Exoterically* upon Points where popular *Prejudices* were concerned,--- it does not follow, that they therefore *disbelieved* the Truth, the real Truth, of the Case upon which they were speaking. Let us suppose, that they had Occasion to speak to the Vulgar concerning the *Gods*; they might speak of *Hercules*, *Aesculapius*, &c. as *Gods*: Or if they had Occasion to speak of a future State, they might speak of *Aeacus* and *Rhadamanthus*, and the Judges of Hell. Now as they who did not believe *Hercules* and *Aesculapius* to be *Gods*, did not for that Reason *disbelieve* the Existence of a governing Mind, so they that did not believe *Aeacus* or *Minos* to be *Judges of Hell*, did not

hot for that Reason *disbelieve* all future Rewards and Punishments. The *more profound Philosophy* was certainly concerned in the searching out these Points: and tho' the Philosophers, or some of them, might find Reason to reject the *Poetical* or *Political Gods*, and to reject too the vulgar Notions of *Styx*, and *Acheron* and *Cocytus*, yet in their Discourses to those who could not enter into the Bottom of Things, they might talk of these *Gods*, or *Rivers*, as really existing. They meant to convey to the People these Truths, --- that there was a governing Being, or a Providence; and a future State of Rewards and Punishments; Things which they *believed* themselves; and desired to have the People believe: and if they laid hold of their *Prejudices*; or their *Capacities*; in order to inculcate what they intended, it is too great a Stride in Argument to infer, that the Teachers did not believe either a God or a future State of Rewards and Punishments.

3: The Immortality of the Soul, and a State of future Rewards or Punishments, was not in itself either an *Esoteric* or an *Exoteric* Doctrine, but the Discourse or Writing on that Subject received its Name

from the Persons to whom, or the Manner, or the Time in which it was delivered. Nor can it be infer'd, that *Plato* did, or did not believe, that the Soul would or would not suffer, or be rewarded hereafter, from the Discourses being proved to be *Esoterical* or *Exoterical*. For if he treated of this Subject *exoterically*, it only follows, that he treated of it in the *popular* Manner, and agreeable to their *Capacities*; and if he treated of the same Subject *Esoterically*, it only follows, that then he treated of it according to the strict Reasons of Things, according to the Nature of the Soul; in short, according to the Rules of the more *profound* and *subtile Philosophy*, in which *Esoteric* Doctrines confisted.

4. If we admit the Accounts, which the Antients have given us, or, if they knew any Thing of this Matter, it will follow, that some of the Books of *Plato*, which Mr. *Warburton* reckons among the *Exoterics* are in Reality *Esoterical*. The *Phædon*, e. g. is an *Esoteric*, as containing the most *profound* and *subtile Philosophy* about the Soul. His *Tenth Book of Laws* contains the most *sublime Reasoning* about the Soul,

the PHILOSOPHERS consider'd. 101
adapted not at all to Vulgar Capacities: He speaks of it as a *self-moving* Being: He enters into the most *subtile* Reasoning about *Motion* and *Movers*, and whether there is any other Beginning of Motion, besides the Change of that, which moves itself: That Soul existed truly and properly before Body: That the Properties of Soul, its Affections, Manners, Thoughts, true Opinions, Memory, were before the Properties of Body: That the Universe is governed by a Mind or Soul: and thence he proceeds to consider the Case of the good Success of wicked Men, and to shew, that the World is governed by God. Can any Thing be more in the *profound* and *subtile* Manner of Philosophising than this?

These Books of *Laws*, it is true, relate to the Knowledge of *Civil Affairs*, and therefore may be said in general to be of the *Exoteric* Kind. But what can be more *Esoteric* than such abstract Reasoning about the Supreme Being? Or did not *Plato* believe that which he so much insisted on to be the Nature of this Supreme Being? Or may there not be *Esoteric* Notions in *Exoteric* Books? Suppose in general, that what-

ever is *Political* in *Plato* was properly *Exoterical*,--- will that prove, that every Thing contained now in such Discourses was actually read *τοῖς ξένοις*, to those without, or that were not his proper Scholars. Notions of the more *abstruse* and *profound* Philosophy, such as are properly *Esoterical*, might be inserted afterwards into *Exoterical Lectures*, when he came to *polish* and correct them, and make them fit for the Reader : And this may be a good Reason why his Books were never divided into the general Classes of *Exoteric* and *Esoteric*.

In the *Phædon*, He shews that Contraries must arise from Contraries ; that the Soul is not *dissolved*, because not *compounded* : That those Things are *simple* and *uncompounded*, which are always the same, in the same Respects, and the same Manner : That the Soul is something *indivisible* : That it is more like to That, which is always the same, than to That which is not so : That it is therefore more like to That which is *Divine*, than to That which is *Mortal* : That from its Being most like to That which is *divine*, *immortal*, *intelligible*, *uniform*, and *indissoluble*, the Soul itself must be *indissoluble*, and

the PHILOSOPHERS consider'd. 103
not like Body that has quite contrary Properties.

It is needless to cite more of this abstract Reasoning from the *Phædon*. There is much more of it, from whence the Immortality of the Soul, and the Punishments of the different Sorts or Degrees of wicked Souls is infer'd ; and the Rewards of Good and Holy ones is established.

Whether *Plato believed*, or not, what he says about the Immortality of the Soul, and its future State, it is certain, that he speaks like one that did *believe* it, and was persuaded of its proper Rewards and Punishments ; and he gives his Reasons for what he says so accurately, and with so much Judgment, that tho' *all the (r) minute Philosophers were to try their Arts, they will never explain those Matters so elegantly ; nor have they Capacities even to understand, what he has, with so much Acuteness, inferred.* Can any Thing be more *subtile*, more in the Way of *deep Philosophy*, than what is urged

(r) *Licet concurrent plebeii omnes Philosophi (sic enim iij qui a Platone et Socrate, et ab illa familia dissident appellandi videntur) non modo nihil unquam tam eleganter explicabunt, sed ne hoc quidem ipsum quam subtiliter conclusum sit, intelligent.* *Cic. Tus. Qu. l. i.*

104 *The DOUBLE DOCTRINE of*
by *Plato* in this Treatise, about the Soul? Is not this therefore all *Esoteric*, if *Gellius* knew any Thing of the Use of that Word? Are not these Notions such as required, *Elementa Eruditionis atque in discendo Studium, The Elements of Knowledge or Instruction, and close Application to Learning?* If so, I cannot think, that Mr. *Warburton* does Justice to his Readers to call these and such Books of *Plato*, *Exoterics*, when in Reality they are in the strictest Propriety, *Esoterics*. But

Fifthly, Upon what Reason, or upon what Grounds does He determine the *Phædon*, or the *Criton*, to be *Exoterical*? The only appearing Reason is, That in these *Plato* has treated of the Immortality of the Soul, and of Rewards and Punishments adjusted to the moral Characters of Persons in a future State. But how will it appear that a Book, containing these Notions, is therefore of the *Exoteric* Kind; since we are assured by good Authority, that the Exoterics related to *Rhetoric*, to a *Readiness in speaking acutely*, or to the *Knowledge of Civil Affairs*: And accordingly I have observed, that *Aristotle* read his *Rhetorical Lectures* in the

Evenings

Evenings or Afternoon Hours: Horis Po-
meridianis. Now to which of these is the
Doctrine of a future State of Rewards and
Punishments reducible. You may as well
say to either of the *former*, as to the *last* ;
since it cannot relate to the Knowledge of
Civil Affairs, but very remotely, and so it
may to any other Subject whatever. The
Old *Platonists* therefore refer'd these Books
to the Class of *Ethical*, not *Political* Treati-
ses ; *Albinus* did so, and so it is in *Diogenes*
Laertius.

But in Mr. *Warburton's* Manner of treat-
ing this Subject, no sooner does any Thing
appear about a future State of Rewards and
Punishments, however it be handled, or
whether it be treated in the more *subtile*
and *profound* Manner or not, but the Tre-
tise, in which it occurs, is pronounced to be
an *Exoteric* : Nay it seems to be the Prin-
cipal, if not the *Only* Test by which he
pronounces some of *Plato's* Tracts to be of
that Class. For take away this, and tell
me why the *Phædon* is an Exoteric ? By the
Rules of the Antients, if they knew the
Meaning of the Distinction of the double
Doctrine, this Book of *Plato's* is so far

from

from being an *Exoteric*, that it is a direct *Esoteric*: for it consists of *abstract*, *subtile* Reasonings in the *profound Philosophy*, beyond vulgar Capacities. And what was beyond their Capacities, or Comprehension, was not at all fit to be read *τοῖς ἔξω*.

Sixthly, Suppose Mr. *Warburton* can prove, that *Plato* did not *believe* what he says about *Hades*, *Styx*, *Acheron*, the Infernal Judges, and the Punishments he describes; still he is to prove (what he has not yet done) that *Plato* did not believe *any* future State of Rewards and Punishments. Has Mr. *Warburton* produced any positive Proof of this? Has he cited any Authority from other Writers for it? Or has he cited any Passage out of *Plato's* own Works that will justify this Charge? No. All that he has done is to shew, that *Plato* has treated of a future State under such Representations as he *could* not, and *did* not, believe to be true. Let this be allowed: What then? Is *Plato* to be charged with disbelieving a future State of Rewards and Punishments, because he did not believe, according to the Letter, his own Figurative, or as *Clemens* calls it, Allegorical Representation of it?

Would

Would not this be saying, that a Christian does not believe a future State, either of Heaven or Hell, because he does not believe the *New Jerusalem* to be built of *Precious Stones*, or the Flames of Hell to be fed with Brimstone in the literal Sense? If any one uses such Language, this is not to be censured, as *saying one Thing and believing another*; but it is using Metaphor or Allegory to represent in the liveliest Manner the Pleasures and Advantages of the One, and the Terrors of the other, (Both which are strictly and firmly *believed*) from Images most agreeable or disagreeable to Mankind in their present Situation, and according to their usual present Ideas. But to return to the Notions of the Double Doctrine.

Seventhly, *Alexander* learnt from *Aristotle*, not only Morality and Policy, but the more abstruse Parts of Learning, which were not usually communicated to the Vulgar. So *Plutarch* tells us; and adds, that it was in *Behalf of Philosophy*, ἵπει φιλοσοφίας, that *Alexander* wrote to him the Letter that is still extant. The Thing that *Alexander* wrote about must either relate to what he was taught about the Art of living

108 *The DOUBLE DOCTRINE of living well*, or else to that System of Philosophy, which was above the Capacities of, and therefore improper to be laid before, the Vulgar. This Latter seems plainly to have been the Case. And if so, then *Esoterics* are uncommon Doctrines, which contained the *Depths of Philosophy*: *Exoterics* were such Notions as were communicated *τοῖς ἔξω, to the Vulgar*, in a plain, familiar Manner. The very same Notions treated in a different Manner might, and very probably did, make the *Esoteric*, or the *Exoteric*: Not that the one was *believed* by the Person that taught it, and not the Other; but that the one entered much *deeper* into the Subject than the Other: the One went to the *Bottom* of the Question, the Other not. And consequently *Alexander* might very justly say, that he should *not differ from Others, if those Principles that he had been instructed in were made common to all.*

Give me Leave to explain this by a similar Case. Mr. *Warburton* has somewhere commended very much a late, ingenious, subtle, abstract Discourse upon the Immortality of the Soul: And no doubt Mr. *Baxter* deserves the highest Commendation for his accurate

accurate and deep Treatise upon so nice a Subject. Let me suppose, that Mr. *Warburton* had some *Pupil* whose Parts and Study had qualified him to hear, and to understand abstract and metaphysical Lectures upon the Nature and Properties of the Soul ; and let me farther suppose, that Mr. *Warburton* had been the true Author of that acute and subtile Book. Let me suppose too, that Mr. *Warburton*, as a Clergyman, might have Occasion to preach to his own, or any other Congregation, a Sermon upon that Subject. Would he preach to the *People*, i. e. τοῖς ἑξω, such Things as he might and would read to his Pupil upon that Subject at Home ? Or if he read and explained in the most accurate and abstract Manner the Chapters of Mr. *Baxter's* Book to his Pupil ; and preached to his People according to their Capacities, in a more loose and open Manner, --- would not one of these Lectures, or Treatises, or Discourses, be justly called *Exoterical*, and the other that enter'd into the Depths of *Metaphysics*, be called *Esterical* ? Should any one arise and charge Mr. *Warburton* with not believing the *Exoterical* Discourses, only because they

110 *The DOUBLE DOCTRINE* of

they were called *Exoterical*, or because it was known that He had used a *Double Doctrine*, would it not be doing a real Injury to the Character of Mr. *Warburton*? And should his Pupil, who understood, and could enter into the *Esoteric* Lectures, and their comprehensive Principles, express his Concern that such a Book was published, and that all others might now understand and know as much of that Matter as himself who had paid so much for his private Instruction. --- Would not this fully account for every Expression in *Alexander's Letter*, and for every Word in *Aristotle's Answer*?

Eightly, Mr. *Warburton* contends, that "all the Legislators, Sages, Priests, and Philosophers publicly taught and propagated, and the People throughout the whole Earth universally believed" a future State of Rewards and Punishments. p 306, and that this Notion was *for the good of Society*, and *therefore only inculcated*. Is it probable that *Aristotle* should instruct his young Pupil, that there was no such thing as a future State of Rewards and Punishments? Would this be one of those *ἀγαπα, best things,* which *Alexander* was so fond of, and which he blamed

blamed his Master for publishing? Would this have tended to make him *live well*, which was one great thing which he learnt from *Aristotle*? Or would not this have exposed *Aristotle* to the Charge of Atheism or Irreligion much better than what was objected to him on Account of his Hymn in honour of *Hermias*, had he instructed his young Pupil in what was contrary to “what all “Legislators, Sages, Priests, Philosophers “publicly taught?” And yet it is certain that *Aristotle* taught *Alexander the Great*, the secret Doctrines, the *Acroatics*, the *Erotics*.

Lastly, This “unreasonable licentious Paradox,” a Title which Mr. *Warburton* has bestowed upon his “New Notion,” p. 304. gives us an Idea of the old Philosophers as a Pack of strange People, *believing one thing and speaking another*: it treats them as gross Liars, so insincere, so dishonest, so imposing on the People, that were any Man to act such a Part now, he would be condemn'd as guilty of the wickedest *Craft*, and would be detested by all honest Men, as justly chargeable with Cunning, Hypocrify, Dissimulation, and the Height of Wickedness.

Wickedness and Immorality. Vices! which *Plato* and the Heathen Philosophers in general condemned, and from their Souls abhor'd! Mr. *Warburton* himself acknowledges this Practice not to be “altogether ‘‘ free from blamè:” So soft is his Censure of so much Disingenuity in the antient Heathens; at the same time that he can lash with Severity all who happen not to be able to run full speed with him into the “Province of Paradox.”

But since in fact the ancient Philosophers had this Double Doctrine, the One *Popular*, or *Exoteric*, the other *Secret* or *Efoteric*, let us consider what is said in Proof that the old Philosophers taught what they did *not* believe, or that “*they said one thing when they thought another.*” p. 307, or 333.

Several general Reasons are offered by Mr. *Warburton* in Evidence for this. As,

i. They all maintained that (*s*) *every one should adhere to the Religion of his Country*: and in Consequence of that, *That it was lawful to deceive for the Public Good*. To prove this, he quotes a Saying of *Scævola* the Ro-

(*s*) *Expedire existimat falli in religione Civitates.* Aug. de Civit. Dei. I. iv. c. 10.

man Pontiff, That it was his Opinion, "that
" Cities should be deceived in Religion." To this he adds; from St. Austin; another Citation: (t) "Varro speaking of Religions,
" says plainly; that there are many things
" true; which it is not useful to the People
" to know; there are likewise many things
" which, though they are false, yet it is ex-
" pedient that the People should not think
" them so." With these he cites a Passage of
Macrobius, to shew that the Philosophers used this "Licence of LYING for the Public
" Good;" upon these Subjects, "concerning
" the SOUL and the NATIONAL GODS," p.
309.—10. or p. 336.

I shall quote the Words of *Macrobius* presently: But I must observe;

I. That Mr. Warburton translates the Words of *Scævola* not with that Accuracy that he should: *Scævola* thought "that CITIES should be deceived in Religion." Why CITIES? Why not, upon his Notion, Countries as well as Cities? He certainly meant, what *Civitates* properly means,

(t) *Varro de Religionibus loquens* evidenter dicit, multa
esse vera, quæ vulgo scire non sit utile; multaque quæ tam-
etsi falsa sint, aliter existimare populum expediat. Augus.
de Civit. Dei. l. iv. c. 10.

whole *Communities*, whole States, all the People under any Government, or that were united in Society, and not *Cities*, which *Civitas* never signifies. But,

2. Let us admit, that all the Philosophers maintained, that *every one should adhere to the Religion of his Country*; and let us suppose too that they all thought it allowable to *deceive for the Public Good*. Will this Consequence follow from these Premises, therefore they all *disbelieved* a future State of proper Rewards and Punishments? It is granted by Mr. Warburton, that “the People throughout the whole Earth universally believed a future State of Rewards and Punishments.” But as to the *Religion of any one's Country*, That consisted in the paying a peculiar Worship to the patron God or Gods of the Country, and in observing the Rites practised in each State. The universal Belief of all Mankind, was quite a different thing from the particular *National Religion* of any Place; and therefore a future State made no part of a *National Religion*, as such, any where. *National Religion* was the particular Form of Religion of one People distinct from that of another; and in consequence

consequence, a Man might adhere to any particular *National Religion*, and yet not concern himself with what was not *National*, but *Universal*; i. e. in other Words, he might maintain that *every one should adhere to the Religion of his Country*, and yet not at all *disbelieve* a future State.

Scævola and *Varro* “ saw the gross Errors of the *National Religions*;” and yet they thought it right that the People should “ every one adhere to the Religion of his *Country*”. They thought that the Gods established by Law should have a religious Regard paid to them: Perhaps too they thought the Priests and Sacrifices, and the usual way of Worship, should be kept up; that the People should be kept in awe by the Religion established by their Ancestors. They knew well enough, I suppose, the Folly and Absurdity of the several *Auguries*, and Divinations of Success from looking into the Entrails of Beasts, the Shape of Flames, and such like Superstitions. They might imagine a great many of the Gods received by the *Romans*, to have been mere Men, or to be mere Names or Qualities; which yet, since they were admitted, should be conti-

nued according to the Customs of the Country. I am much mistaken, if the Notions and Practices of many political Christians are not the same *in this respect* with the Notions and Practices of these political Heathens. No Innovations are to be made, no not for the sake of Truth; Popery, when once it is established, and People are accustomed to it, is to be adher'd to: Whatever Exceptions may be made, and however just, to certain received Dogma's or Practices, yet Alterations may create Disturbances. Such a Nation in *Varro* or in *Scævola*, will fully account for every Expression they used on this Occasion: Nor ought any one to conclude from their Words, that these Men imagined *All Religion* to be false and groundless; or that, in particular, they *disbelieved* a future State of Rewards and Punishments: Since they might consistently think, that the main Points in Religion might be true, and yet some things in the *National Religions* to be false; or that it was not *tanti*, or wou'd be wrong, to endeavour to remove the Peoples Prejudices in them.

From these general Words therefore, used by the *Roman Pontif*, and by *Varro*, no one

can infer, without further Light, any particular Point that they disbelieved. It is certain that they imagined some things to be wrong, but what they were in particular, we should be as much in the dark, if we had no further Intimations of their Sentiments, as if they had never declared any Suspicions or Doubts. And in consequence, to argue that the Philosophers disbelieved, in particular, *a future State of Rewards and Punishments*, because they thought it allowable to say one thing and think another in some Cases, is arguing a *posse ad esse*, from the Possibility to the Fact.

But we happen to know what were the particular Points which Scævola thought right to have the People be deceived in. St. Austin tells us, that (a) Scævola argued that there were Three sorts of Gods; one given us by the Poets, a second by the Philosophers, a third by the Civil Magistrate. The First sort was all trifling and idle: The Second was not

(a) Doctissimum Pontificem Scævolam disputasse tria genera tradita Deorum; unum a Poetis, alterum a Philosophis, tertium a principibus Civitatis. Primum genus nugatorium dicit esse. — Secundum non congruere civitatibus, quod habeat aliqua quæ oblit populis nosse. — Quæ sunt autem illa quæ prolata in multitudinem nocent? Hæc inquit; non esse Deos Herculem, Aesculapium, Castorem, Pollucem: proditur enim a doctis, quod homines fuerint, & humana conditione defecerint. Aug. de Civ. Dei. l. iv. c. 27.

suited to Governments, because there were some things which it might be prejudicial to the People to know. Now what are those things which, if laid open to the common People, would be prejudicial to them? Why, that Hercules, Aesculapius, Castor, Pollux, were not Gods; for learned Men tell us that they were Men. — We know from hence, what Scævola meant by saying, that "People under Government were to be deceived in Religions." Not that he *disbelieved* a future State, or that he had any Notion of its being right to *say what he did not think* upon that Subject of the Soul's Immortality, and future Existence in Happiness or Misery. This Saying therefore of his is sadly misapplied by Mr. Warburton, when he brings it in to prove, that the Philosophers did not believe a future State of Rewards and Punishments; or that they had a *Double Doctrine* about this Matter. Since then we know the particular Notion that Scævola had in view, we can the easier pass on to *Macrobius*.

Macrobius tells us, "on what Subjects the Philosophers used this Licence of lying for the Public Good." He says it was

was (x) "concerning the Soul and the National Gods." Scævola's Notion extended only to the Hero-Gods; and these he would not have the People be undeceived in: But *Macrobius* had added another Subject, in which, Mr. Warburton says, they thought it lawful to lie for the Public Good, viz. the Soul; and in consequence, that the double Doctrine extended to these two Points. It will be necessary to explain to you the Intent of *Macrobius*.

His Design in this Chapter is to shew, how Truth may be told under the Cover of a *Figment*; and in what particulars a Philosopher, strictly philosophising about divine Things, might fairly admit of *Fable*. *Colotes* had maintained that a Philosopher ought not to invent or to use *Fable* at all; and therefore that *Plato's Eros* was an Absurdity, and by parity of Reason so was *Scipio's Dream in Tully*. Upon this he enquires, whether Philosophy either rejects all, or admits all, *Fable*; and he shews (y) that if the manner

(x) *Sciendum est tamen, non in omnem disputationem philosophos admittere fabulosa V & L Licita; sed his uti solent cum vel de Anima, vel de aeriis æthereisive potestatibus, vel de cæteris Diis loquuntur.* *Macrob. Somn. Scip. li. i. c. 2.*

(y) *Nam cum veritas argumento subest, solaque fit narratio fabulosa, non unus reperitur modus, per figmentum vera referendi.* *ibid.*

of the Narration only be fabulous, and Truth is really told under such Story, it may be right; and that there is more than one way of telling Truth under a Figment, or the Veil of a Figment. This he explains by Instances, and then adds, that since Er, discovering what he had seen, or Scipio, telling what he had dreamt, give occasion for no Injury to the Point in hand, but the Discovery of sacred Things has all its Dignity preserved, Colotes ought to acquiesce and distinguish what is a fabulous Narration from Falshood; and then immediately follow the Words which Mr. Warburton has quoted. --- *Sciendum est tamen, non in omnem disputationem Philosophos admittere fabulosa vel licita, sed his uti solent, cum vel de anima, vel de aeriis ætheriisve potestatibus, vel de cæteris Deis loquuntur.* But yet you must understand that Philosophers do not upon every Subject admit fabulous Narrations, EVEN such as are lawful on other Occasions, but they use them when they treat either concerning the Soul, or the aerial or æthereal Powers, or concerning the Gods. But when the Discourse is about the Great, the chief of all Gods --- or Mind --- when they speak of these, viz. the Great God, and Mind, they

they never so much as touch upon any Thing
fabulous.

This was the Occasion of these Words;
and it is easy to observe,

1. That Mr. Warburton strangely misrepresents this Passage of *Macrobius*, and makes it speak what *Macrobius* never thought of; for there is not one Word about a *double Doctrine* concerning the *Soul*, or *natural Gods*. He is speaking only concerning the Subjects whereon the Philosophers used *Fable*, or not; but not a Word concerning Points whereon they said one Thing, and believed another.

2. Mr. Warburton supposes that the covering Truth with the Veil of Fable is *Lying*, or *Lying for the Public Good*; concerning which there is not one Word in *Macrobius*; for he supposes real Truth to be cover'd over by *Fable*, and Fable to be a Manner of telling Truth.

3. Mr. Warburton has corrupted *Macrobius*, or very much misrepresented him; in order to make him speak what he wanted. He has changed in his last Edition those Words, *Fabulosa vel licita*, which signifies, *fabulous Narrations*, even such as are lawful, or

or allowed; into *Fabulosa velut licita*. The Philosophers, says *Macrobius*, are allowed in many Cases to use *Fable*; but upon some Points they never admit *Fabulous Narrations*, even such as are allowed in other Cases. It is lawful to use *Fable*, when they speak of the Soul, or of Aerial Powers; i.e. to dress up their Discourses in *Fables*; but when they speak of the *Great God*, the first Cause of all, or of *Mind*, which the Greeks call *νοῦς*, they never touch upon *Fable*. What is there in all this, which relates to the Philosophers using a Licence “of lying for the Public Good?” As if it were in any Sense *Lying*, to use *Fable*, or Fabulous Representations, such as *Plato’s Er*, or *Scipio’s Dream*.

Thus much to his *First* general Reason, that “the Antient Sages held it allowable “to lie for the public Good”; or “to say “one Thing, when they thought another.” His *Second* general Reason advances a little further: It is to prove, that “the antient Sages did actually say one Thing, “when they thought another.” p. 310, or p. 336. When he first proposed what he intended to prove, p. 397, or 333, he expressed

expressed himself thus ;--- *They perpetually practised what they thus professed to be lawful.* Surely this is directly contrary to the Proof of his *first general Reason.* For in that he had proved, that they never did this but upon *Two Points*, the *Soul*, and the *National Gods*; and in this he undertakes to prove, that they did it *perpetually*. Or again, when they spoke according to his own Meaning of the Word *Esoterically*, then they did *not speak one Thing, and think another*; and therefore they did not *perpetually practise what they thus professed to be lawful.*

But be his Meaning of the Words *perpetually* and *actually* what he pleases, his Proof of his Position is entirely taken from " that general Practice in the Greek Philosophy of a Twofold Doctrine, the *External*, and the *Internal*, a *vulgar* and a *secret* one." p. 336, or 310. It is true, that they had an *Esoteric* and an *Exoteric* Doctrine; which Mr. Warburton here owns to have been " but one and the same that was handled thus differently, viz. popularly and scientifically." And is it owned at last, that the *Esoteric* and *Exoteric* Doctrine

trine was *one and the same*, “only handled differently, popularly and scientifically”? Was the Esoteric Doctrine no more believed, than he says the Exoteric was? If they were *one and the same*, and the handling them differently gave Occasion to the Distinction of Names, then no Argument can be drawn from a Doctrine’s being Exoteric, that it was *not believed*, more than there can from its being *Esoteric*, that it was believed. What Proof can now be produced,--- that in the twofold Doctrine they *actually said one Thing, and believed another*? What Instance is or can be produced of this Fact? What Declarations of any of the Philosophers can imply that such was their Practice? Under this Head some Thing ought to have been produced in Confirmation of this Fact, *more* than was done under the last Head: But instead of that, even *less* is done: Here is not so *much* as the Instance of *Fable* or *Allegory* produced. But instead of a plain *Fact*, that those who maintained the Double Doctrine *actually* or *perpetually* said one Thing, and believed another; He has only given us “*a View of the Progress of the*

“*Greek*

"Greek Philosophy;" which, whether true or false, is nothing to the Point in Hand.

His *Third* general Reason is as little to the Point, and if it be made good, it will not prove, that the Philosophers taught the Doctrine of a future State of Rewards and Punishments without believing it. His Reason is stated thus;— "the Antient Sages *practised* the double Doctrine in the Point *in Question.*" Thus he speaks positively and express, p. 307, or 333. But when p. 319, or 346, he comes to prove this very Assertion, How artfully are the Terms changed? instead of saying, That "they *practised* it with Regard to the very *Doctrine in Question*", which are his Words in the first Place, he only says, that the antient Sages SEEMED TO PRACTISE *the double Doctrine in the Point in Question.* The double Doctrine, as I have shewn, did not consist in *saying one Thing and believing another*: If therefore the antient Sages practised *the double Doctrine* in the Case of a future State of Rewards and Punishments, Mr. Warburton will fall short still of the Point to be proved, unless the double Doctrine be proved to consist in the Philosophers *not believing*

believing what they taught ; whereas he has observed, that the double Doctrine consisted only in a POPULAR or SCIENTIFICAL Handling any Point.

When, by such *general Reasons* as these, Mr. Warburton had thought he had abated the Readers Prejudices against his new Notion, he descends to *Particulars* : And here we may expect to have plain *Facts*. But does he produce one single Instance of e.g. *Plato's not believing what he says* about a future State of Rewards and Punishments ? No : He produces indeed a Saying or two of his, p. 351, or 383. "That there are "some Truths it is not fit the People should "know.—That the World is not to be entrust- "ed with the true Notion of God ; and that "in his *Laws*, which were of the Exoteric "Kind, he defends the popular Opinions of "the Gods ; but in his *Cratylus*, which was "of the Esoteric Kind, he laughed at the "Antients for worshipping the Sun and "Stars as Gods."

Let this be all granted : Would Mr. Warburton from hence infer, that *Plato* actually *disbelieved* the Existence of God, or that he did not believe, that a Soul per- vaded

vaded the Universe? Let him speak for the *popular Opinions* at some Times, and even laugh at them at other Times, all that will follow is, that *Plato* disbelieved the *popular Opinions* of the *Gods*, not that he disbelieved the Being of a *God*: And so in the other Case, supposing that he did not believe the *popular Opinions* of a future State of Rewards and Punishments, that there were Three Judges in *Hades*, &c. it will not follow that he did *not believe* a future State of real proper Rewards and Punishments.

Plato thought there were *some Truths which it was not fit the People should know*: e. g. that the World is not to be entrusted with the true Notion of *God*. *Sævola* in like manner thought, that the People were not to be entrusted with the Secret, that *Hercules*, *Aesculapius*, *Castor*, *Pollux*, were *not Gods*, but had been mortal Men. In this Point then they complied with popular Prejudices, believing the Existence of *God* and his Providence, tho' not believing the popular Opinions of the National Gods. And so in the other Case, they complied with popular Notions of *Hades*, and its Judges, and its Rivers, &c. believing the Reality

Reality of a future State of Rewards and Punishments; tho' not the *popular Prejudices* upon that Subject. If Mr. Warburton will call this, *believing one Thing, and saying another*, or *lying* for the Public Good; if speaking to the People, and complying with their Ideas, and not to strict philosophical Truth, in *Morals* or *Politics*, be thus to be branded, I question whether every Man's Discourses, taken strictly and literally, must not have the infamous Mark of *Lying* put upon them.

But Mr. Warburton has assigned several *particular Reasons* to shew, that *Plato* did not believe this Notion of future Rewards and Punishments. As

1. "The *Platonic Philosophy* being *entirely Pythagorean* in the Point in Question, and this latter rejecting the Doctrine of a future State of Rewards and Punishments, we might fairly conclude them Both under the same Predicament."

p. 353, or 385. Now Mr. Warburton himself hath shewn, that the *Platonic Philosophy* is *not entirely Pythagorean* in this very Point, as will appear presently.

2. He tells us, " That *Plato* has argued
 much for the Eternity, or the Immortal-
 ity of the Soul. But to know what Sort
 of Immortality he meant,--- his Argu-
 ments were natural and metaphysical,
 fetch'd from the Essence and Qualities of
 the Soul, which therefore concluded only
 for its *Permanency*, and this *he really or*
certainly believed." ibid. He then is
 confessed to believe the Permanency, Eter-
 nity, Immortality of the Soul, from Argu-
 ments drawn from its *Essence* and *Qualities*.
 Now are not these the Topics urged in his
Phædon, and his Tenth Book of *Laws*?
 How is it then that *these Books* are reckoned
 by Mr. *Warburton* *Exoterical*, since it seems
 they contained Doctrines about the future
 State of the Soul, which *Plato believed* to
 be true? Or is not this a more conclusive
 Argument, that *these Books* were *Esoteri-
 cal*, than can be produced to prove them
 in his Sense, *Exoterical*? And if he believ-
 ed the Soul to be *immortal* or permanent,
 from Arguments taken from its *Essence* and
Qualities, what Sort of Proof is this, that
 He did not believe a State of proper Re-
 wards and Punishments? It is, or may be

allowed, that *Plato* did not use *Moral Arguments* to prove the Eternity of the Soul ; but whilst he urged Natural and Metaphysical ones, which proved its future Existence, and he commonly spoke of the Rewards and Punishments it was to undergo in a future State ; and this in the same Books ; a Man must distinguish very subtilly to say, that one Paragraph is *Exoterical*, and *not believed*, another is *Esoterical*, fully demonstrative, and scientifical, and *fully believed* by its Author. Especially if the Passages *not believed* make the *Book* to be Exoterical ; the Passages *believed* have the same Right to make the same Book *Esoterical*.

The Third Reason is, what Mr. *Warburton* must principally depend on. It begins thus,--- “ As the inventing Reasons for “ the Immortality of the Soul, was one “ Cause of his [*Plato's*] being esteemed the “ grand Patron of this Belief, so another “ was *his famous Refinement* (for it was in-“ deed *HIS*) of the natural *Metempsychosis*, “ the peculiar Doctrine of the *Pythagoreans*. ”

P. 354, or 386. Now,

Is not this a direct Contradiction to the First Reason here produced, which asserted

the

the Platonic Philosophy to be ENTIRELY Pythagorean in the Point in Question? Or how did *Plato* make his famous Refinement, one that was indeed HIS, and yet continue ENTIRELY in the same Notion with Pythagoras? Or was his famous Refinement of the natural Metempsychoisis, entirely Pythagorean, when he added a Moral Designation to it? For thus Mr. Warburton goes on; " *Plato* on receiving this Notion [viz. the Natural Metempsychoisis] from his Master, gave it this Additional Improvement, that these Changes and Transitions were the PURGATIONS of IMPURE MINDS, unfit by Reason of the Pollutions they had contracted; to re-ascend the Place from whence they came, and rejoin that Substance from whence they were disperced; and consequently that pure, immaculate Souls were exempt from this Transmigration." ibid.

This then was *Plato's* Esoteric Doctrine; and Mr. Warburton confesses, " that this seemed to have something of a moral Designation in it, which his Master's had not." The natural Metempsychoisis was, that the successive Transition of the Soul

" into other Bodies was phisical and necessary, and exclusive of all *moral Designation* whatever." *Plato* gave this an *additional Improvement*, by making the Transition of the Soul to be in order to a *Purgation*: that impure Souls, by Reason of the Pollutions they had contracted, could not re-ascend the Place from whence they came. Now,

1. This State of *Purgation* was a State to which *impure* Souls were condemned; and consequently was a State of future Punishment. It is not to the Purpose, to enquire in what the *Punishment* of *wicked* Souls according to *Plato* consisted; or what were the particular Rewards, which they might enjoy: The only Point that here is in Debate, is, Whether *Plato* believed *any* future State of Rewards and Punishments at all? It is plain, that he added something to, or made an Improvement upon the *natural* Scheme of *Pythagoras*, and so far as he added to his Master's Notion, so far his Notions were *not entirely Pythagorean*. Now either *Plato's* Scheme had no more *Moral Designation* in it than *Pythagoras's* Scheme had, or it had some *Moral Designation*. If it had none,

none, what was the *Refinement*, what was the *additional Improvement*, grounded on *Impurities* contracted, *Pollutions*, Immorality, Misbehaviour, which caused such Souls to be uncapable to re-ascend to the Place they came from? If it had some *Moral Designation*, then the Belief of a future State of Rewards and Punishments was consistent with *Plato's Scheme*, and might be believed by him.

But it seems, both *Plato* and *Pythagoras*, "agreed in excluding the Notion of all future State of Rewards and Punishments." *ibid.*

This should not be asserted without good Proof. *Pythagoras's* Notion was, "That there was a necessary and natural Transition of the Soul into Bodies, exclusive of all moral Considerations whatever," p. 346, or 378. This was peculiarly his; an Esoteric Doctrine, delivered to be believed." *Plato's* Addition was, "that impure Souls passed into other Bodies by Way of *Purgation*, as unfit to re-ascend to the Place from whence they came, by Reason of Pollutions." Now if pure, immaculate Souls immediately re-ascended to

the Place from whence they came, and *polluted* Souls were obliged to transmigrate till they were *purged*; and this on Account of the *Pollutions* contracted, whilst they informed the human Body,--- then there must be a Distinction made betwixt Good and Evil Men after they die: And this is what is meant by a future State of Rewards and Punishments; and this must be of a *moral* Designation. If the Soul of *Cain* (e.g.) is condemned to animate the Body of a Lion, Wolf, or any other wild Beast, and to pass from one to another for a thousand, or ten thousand Years, or longer, or shorter, on account of the *Pollutions* it had contracted, whilst it informed the Body of *Cain*;--- This is a *Punishment* supposed to be proportioned to the Wickedness of *Cain*: And if *Abel's* Soul, pure and immaculate, *presently* ascended to its Place of Happiness, This was His *Reward* for his Virtue and Goodness.

Should you say, that this Transmigration and Re-ascent were *natural* and *necessary*, exclusive of all *moral* Considerations whatever, this would be absurd; because the *Pollutions* contracted thro' the immoral Behaviour of Persons here, make a Difference between

between impure and pure Souls. Those became *unfit* to re-ascend to the Place from whence they came, because of the Vices they had been guilty of: These were *fit* to re-ascend, because they had contracted no Vices, and therefore wanted no Purgation: Or if any had contracted but a *little Pollution*, he was not to be continued in a State of Purgation so long, as if he had been very much polluted. The *Unfitness* therefore, or the *Fitness* to re-ascend, depended on the *Immorality*, or the *Morality* of the Man. When therefore *Plato* made this additional Improvement to, or Refinement upon *Pythagoras's* Scheme, He must believe a *Moral Designation*, or else he did not see the immediate Use or Design of his own Improvement.

Mr. *Warburton's* fourth Argument is this.
“ *Plato* in his Writings much inculcates
“ the Doctrine of a future State of Rewards
“ and Punishments, --- and with so much
“ Seriousness, as shews he *had a Mind* to
“ be believed. But did he himself believe
“ them? We may be assured he did not.”
P. 354, or 387. Why? “ For being the
“ most spiritualized of the Philosophers,

" had he really *believed* a future State of Rewards and Punishments, he would have refined and purified it, as he did the Doctrine of the Eternity of the Soul, which he certainly believed." This Argument goes entirely upon this Supposition, that whatever *Plato believed*, he refined and purified. Mr. *Warburton* goes on: " But he has as good as told us, what he thought of it [a future State of Rewards and Punishments] in his *Epinomis*, where Writing of the Condition of a good and wise Man after Death, he says, *Of whom, whether I be in Jest, or in Earnest, I constantly affirm, &c.*" p. 355. Here he stops. What now is it that *Plato* constantly affirms? Why? (x) That when a wise Man dies, He shall be happy, blessed, most wise; and, (y) that it is not possible but for very few Men to become perfectly happy and blessed.

(x) Εὐδαίμονα ἔσεσθαι, καὶ σοφώτατον ἄμα καὶ μακάρειον.
Flat. *Epinomis*.

(y) Ως ὡς δυνατὸν ἀνθρώποις τελέως μακαρίοις τε καὶ εὐδαίμονι γενέσθαι πλὴν ὀλέγοις. *ibid.*

The whole Passage is thus; "Ον καὶ διηγεῖζομαι πάντων καὶ περιόδων ἄμα, ὅτε θανάτῳ τὶς τὰν τοιούτων τὴν ἀντί^τοις μοίειν αναπλήσει, χρεῖδην ἐάνπερ αποθανὼν ἦ, μήτε μεθέξειν ἔτι πολλῶν τότε καθάπτερ νῦν ἀιδήσεων, μιᾶς τε [I. δὲ] μοίεις μετειληπτία μόνον καὶ ἐκ πολλῶν ἔνα γεγονότα, εὐδαίμονα τε ἔσεσθαι καὶ σορῆλας ἄμα καὶ μακάρειον. Plat. *Epin.* sub finem.

This

This is what *Plato* here says ; and can any one infer from these Words, that *Plato* did not believe a future State of Rewards at least ?

But let us examine this Passage of *Plato*, since it is produced at large in the third Edition, p. 388. Mr. *Warburton* translates it thus. *Of whom* [viz. the wise and good Man] *both in Jest, and in Earnest, I constantly affirm, that when such a one shall have finished his destined Course by Death, he shall at his Dissolution be stript of those many Senses which he here enjoy'd, and then only participate of one simple Lot and Condition. And, of MANY as he has here, being become ONE, he shall be happy, wise and blessed.*

My first Objection to Mr. *Warburton's* Translation is, that he renders παιζων καὶ σεβαλ-ζων ἄμα, whether *I* be in *Jest*, or in *Earnest*, or as it is since corrected, *both in Jest, and in Earnest*. *Plato* never speaks of such Subjects as the future State of good Men, *in Jest*; nor is that the Meaning of the Phrase, παιζων καὶ σεβαλζων, in *Plato*.

We see when *Parmenides* was going to treat of the most abstract and difficult Subject, the most Philosophical that is, I think, in

in all *Plato*, he says, he was going περιπατησαιν ταῦταν ταῖς τε : Not to talk in *Fest*; but what we shoud call, to play a difficult Game, to undertake a hard Task. Παιζειν εἶναι περιπατησαιν is a Manner of Expression, which *Plato* frequently uses; and he means by it no more than constantly, at all Times.

In his first Book of *Laws*, he says, *He that would become a good Man, ought strait from his Childhood to meditate and exercise himself constantly, παιζούσι τε οὐ περιπατησούσι, in every Thing that relates to his Business, be it what it will.* Not in *Fest*, but at all Times, even in his *Relaxations*, *Plat. p. 643.* So again he uses the Substantives, ἐν περιπατήσιν εἶναι περιπατησούσι, not for *Fest* and *Earnest*, but for regular Constancy and Steadiness, *ibid. p. 647.* In another Place in the same Book of *Laws*, speaking of the common Compotations or Feastings in *Crete* and *Lacedæmon*, and the Consequences of them, that they had perverted natural Pleasures, he adds, ἐπει παιζούσι τῆς περιπατησούσι δεῖ ἐνοεῖν τὰ πειθαλα, ἐνονθέον δὲ, &c. Whether one ought to consider these Things with Exactness, or less carefully, you must understand, &c. i. e. you must at all times understand, *p. 636.* Now tho' παιζειν may

in itself signify *to jest*, yet when it is put in this Construction, with the other Word, *ανδιζειν*, it does not signify, *in Jest*, in Opposition to *Earnest*, but the Phrase implies a regular, uniform Constancy in any Thing. And this is what *Plato* here means, that he at all Times *constantly* maintained and proved by the strongest Arguments, that when any good or wise Man shall finish his destin'd Course by Death, He shall “*at his Dissolution be stripped of those many Senses which he here enjoy'd.*” As soon as he dies, *he shall not then any longer partake of many Senses as he does here*, πότε μεθέξειν της πολλῶν τιτε κατάπερ νῦν οἰδητέων. He shall not any longer partake of many Senses, which are but the first Principles or Entrances to Reason, *but having partook of One only Lot or Condition, and being as it were made one out of many, he will be for the future, happy, most wise, and blessed.*

To understand this, I must observe, that *Archytas* the *Pythagorean*, *Plato's Master*, had distinguished very accurately in a set Discourse betwixt *Aίσθησις* and *Noῦς*, *Sense* and *Mind*. A Fragment of it is still remaining

maining in *Stobæus*. “ *Mind*, says he, is
“ the Judge of the most valuable Things :
“ *Sense* of the most useful ; for *Sense* was
“ made for the Sake of the Body, and to
“ serve That, but *Mind* was made to re-
“ gulate even these : *Mind* is the Principle
“ of Knowledge : *Sense* of Opinion : *Sense*
“ relates only to such Things as are *Sen-
“ sible* : *Mind* to what is *intelligible*. What
“ is *sensible* is moved and changed, and
“ never stable, and therefore is found to be
“ more and less, better and worse : but
“ *Mind*, being concerned only with *Intel-
“ ligibles*, is never changed. *Mind* is in-
“ divisible, *Sense* not so.” This, and a
good deal more, is found in *Archytas*, as
the Fragment is preserved in *Stobæus*, Ec-
log. l. i. p. 92. No wonder therefore
that *Plato* says, that we shall in a future
State be stripped of our *many Senses*, and by
that Means become *most wise*, and *blessed*, and
happy, since These [*many Senses*] being adapt-
ed to our present Circumstances only, and the
Service of the Body, will cease at our
Death, and a more noble Principle will take
Place, by Means of which we shall be-
come

come most wise. The Good Man therefore shall not partake of many Senses, as now he does ; but being stripped of them, and having partook of One only Lot or Condition, and being as it were made One out of Many, he will be for the future happy, most wise, and blessed.

What Foundation is here for the Imagination that *Plato* "here secretly intimated, " that when he was *in Fest*, he affirmed " the future Happiness of good Men in a " peculiar and distinct Existence, which is " the popular Notion of a future State : " But when *in Earnest*, that that Existence " was not peculiar or distinct, but a *common* " *Life* without particular Sensations." p. 388. *Plato* never intimates, that he maintained Two distinct Notions, *one in Fest*, and the other *in Earnest* : But he affirms, that he maintained One single Point, the self-same Notion concerning the future State of a Good Man, constantly, at all Times, without any Variation, that such a Man would become *most Wise*, and *Happy*. What *Tully* says of *Socrates* is true of *Plato* ; *qui non tum hoc, tum illud, ut in plerisque ; sed idem dicebat semper, animos hominum esse divinos*

divinos, ijsque, cum e corpore excessissent, reditum ad cælum patere, optimoque et justissimo cuique expeditissimum, quod idem Scipioni videbatur. Cic. de Amicit. *He did not say sometimes one Thing; sometimes another, as many do; but he always said the SAME Thing; that the Souls of Men were divine, and when they went out of the Body, they returned to Heaven: and that every very Good and Just Man went thither without any Difficulty.* Scipio had the very same Notion.

2. The many *Senses or Sensations*, ~~diabolorum~~, which here a good and wise Man has, are such as are inconsistent with, or contrary to his being perfectly happy, and perfectly wise. He must therefore be deprived of them, as soon as ever he dies; and then he is to become happy, and most wise. The many Sensations therefore, which we have here, will be instantly removed, and then we shall partake of *One only Condition*, viz. *Happiness*, free from that Mixture of Evils which here we partake of, and *perfect Wisdom*. What has this to do with the Good Man's "Resolution into the $\tau\delta\ \bar{\nu}$ "? Or is it not equally true, supposing the
good

good Man to continue in a separate, distinct Existence?

3. Plato goes on, and adds, *καὶ εἰ πολλῶν τέλεων* τὸν γεγονότα, which Mr. Warburton says may signify, "that of his many Sensations he hath only one left, the feeling Happiness," which is the true and only consistent Sense of *Plato*; or else, "that from being in the Number of many Individuals of the same Species, he is become One, by being join'd to, and united with the Universal Nature," *ibid.* This last cannot be the Meaning of the Words, because the Wise and Good Man, by being united with the Universal Nature, would not by that become *happy, most wise, blessed*, but would loose that *Wisdom*, which he had already. Or if he is supposed, when united to the universal Nature, to acquire more Happiness, as *Plato* says he will, and to be **MORE WISE** than he was before; then, if he retains his individual Knowledge, and his Wisdom and Happiness are much *improved*, here is a proper State of future Reward; the very contrary to which this Passage is produced to prove. If, by being absorbed in universal Nature, the Good Man loses

loses all Consciousness, HE does not become *most Wise*; but the Person, the HE, is lost, or swallowed up in the τὸν οὐ. HE is not *more wise*, but something compounded of all Good and Wise Men, a different Person made up of all these, becomes most wise, which is contrary to *Plato's Sense*. But, if he means, that the several distinct, individual Consciousnesses of Good Men continue still, and are improved, then here is a proper State of Reward, which *Plato* really meant.

As I am here speaking concerning this Passage in the *Epinomis*, I would observe one Thing further.

Plato's Books of Laws are (it seems) affirmed by Mr. Warburton to be *Exoterical*; but the *Epinomis* to be an *Esoterical* Treatise. If this be so; I ask, how comes *Plato* in his eighth Book of Laws, where he treats of *Sacrifices*, to do it so slightly, as if he disapproved of that Practice, and this in an *Exoteric* Book: And yet in his *Epinomis*, which is an *Esoteric* Book, he advises to *keep up to the Customs of one's Country*? Now just the Reverse of this should have been his Conduct; and he should have advised to keep up the Custom of

of one's Country in an *Exoteric* Book, and to have treated of Sacrifices *slightly*, or not at all in an *Esoteric*. But this by the by.

Mr. Warburton's 5th and last Argument is, "that the most intelligent of the Antients regarded what *Plato* said of a future State of Rewards and Punishments, as said in the *Exoteric* way to the People, and not believed by himself." p. 355. or 388. To confirm this, he cites *Chrysippus*, *Strabo* and *Celsus*; not one of which in terms, or directly, affirms, that *Plato* did not believe a future State of Rewards and Punishments, or even says that he spoke on this Subject in what Mr. Warburton means by the *Exoteric* way to the People." These are Consequences drawn by Mr. Warburton from their Words: and such Consequences as any one may safely deny. *Chrysippus*, as Mr. Warburton says, "condemned *Plato*'s wrong Judgment, not his wrong Belief, in imagining such childish Terrors could be useful to the Cause of Virtue." Because He condemned his wrong Judgment in using such Terrors as he did to serve the cause of Virtue, therefore Mr. Warburton concludes that *Chrysippus* thought that *Plato* did not

at all believe a future State of Rewards and Punishments. Suppose any one were to condemn Mr. Warburton's wrong Judgment, for insisting on the Demonstration he brings for the Divine Legation of *Moses*, would it be right to infer that such a one thought he did not believe the Divine Legation at all?

Strabo too says, "that the *Indian Brak-mans* invented Fables, as *Plato* did, concerning the *Immortality of the Soul* and a future Judgment." *ibid.* Now Mr. Warburton owns that *Plato* really believed the *Immortality of the Soul*, which yet Strabo finds fault with as much as he does with the *future Judgment*. Strabo's Testimony therefore is nothing to the purpose, since in fact *Plato* believed the *Immortality of the Soul*, as is confessed: And as to the other Point, it does not imply that *Plato* did not believe the State of future Rewards and Punishments itself, whether he believed the *Fables* or not.

As to *Celsus*, "he owns that what *Plato* has said about the future State, is not easy for every one to find out: That you must be able to understand what he meant by the Soul's inability and sluggishness to get up to the highest Region, and, what is the true Heaven

" Heaven and true Light." But how does this prove, that *Celsus* thought that *Plato* did not believe a proper future State of Rewards and Punishments?

And now I am speaking of *Plato*, you'll excuse me if I examine Mr. *Warburton's* Account of a remarkable Passage in the *Gorgias*, which has given him no small Trouble, all arising from a Mistake of his own. His Translation is this: (z) " There was this Law concerning Mortals in the time of *Saturn*, and is now always informed by the Gods, that he who hath lived a just and pious Life, should at his Death be carried into the Islands of the Blessed, and there possess all kinds of Happiness, untainted with the Evils of Mortality: but that he who had lived unjustly and impiously should be thrust into a Place of Punishment, the Prison of divine Justice; called *Tartarus*. Now the Judges with

(z) Ὡς διν ο νόμος ὃδε πειθ αὐθέωπαν ἐπὶ Κέρκυρας καὶ αἰτιαὶ τοῦ εἴηντι εἶναι εἰ θεοῖς. Τῶν αὐθέωπών τὸν μὲν δικαίως τὸν βίου διελθόντα καὶ θάνατον, ἀπειδίνη τελευτήν, εἰς μακράν γῆσσος ἀπίστοντα, οἷον εἰ πάσῃ ἐνδαιμονίᾳ ἐπίτοις κακῷ, τὸν δὲ αδίκως καὶ αἰθέως, εἰς τὸ τῆς τίσεως τε καὶ δίκης δεσμωτήρειον, οἱ δὴ Τάρταρον καλέσσιν; οἶναι. Τατών δὲ δικασταὶ ἐπὶ Κέρκυρας καὶ ἔτι Κεφαλλίαι, τῇ Διός τὴν αρχὴν ἔχοντες, ζῶντες πόσαν ζωτικὸν δικαίωνται δικαζόντες; Μέταλλοιν τε κερτίζειν κακῶς εἰς δίκαια κατεῖνοσθε. Plato. Gorgias. p. 523.

" whom the Execution of this Law was intrusted, were, in the time of *Saturn*, and under the Infancy of *Jove's Government*, living Men, sitting in Judgment on the living, and decreeing and appointing the very Day, on which every one should die. This gave occasion to iniquitous and perverse Judgments." p. 209, or 226.

How hard is Mr. Warburton put to it, to account for some Passages in this Fable, arising from *the Judges passing Sentence in Life, and PREDICTING the Day of the Criminal's Death?* He tells us of an old *Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction*, p. 214. and then tells us, that "by PREDICTING the Day of the Criminal's Death, was meant the Infliction of a Capital Punishment; and by Prometheus's taking the Gift from these Judges was meant, the Civil Magistrate's Abolition of the Jurisdiction." *ibid.* What will not Fancy at this rate get over?

First, He tells us, that those which were carried into the Islands of the Blessed, upright and virtuous Men, there possess all kinds of Happiness, *untainted with the Evils of Mortality*. Plato's Words are *ἐκτὸς νακῶν*, *out of the reach of Evils*; not of Mortality, but of *all Evils* whatever. The Fable supposes

poses the Souls of Men to live in a future State, and to subsist in either Happiness or Misery. Now good Men here were to be happy hereafter, not “untainted with the “Evils of Mortality,” but to *dwell in all Happiness out of the reach of all Evils.*

2. There is not one Word in *Plato* about living Men *decreeing and appointing the very Day on which every one should die.* Plato's Words are, Τάτων δὲ δικαστὶ — ζῶντες ἡσαν ζώντων, ἐκείνη οὐδέποτε δικαζόντες, οὐ μέλλοντες τελευταῖν. *The Judges of THESE [viz. who had lived either well or ill] were living Men sitting in Judgment on living Men, upon the very Day on which they were to die.* Not, **DECREEING and APPOINTING the very Day on which every one should die;** but sitting in Judgment and passing Sentence upon the Day in which Men were to die.

This Mistake was a little amended in the latter Edition, and we have it thus, --- *living Men, sitting in Judgment on the living, and decreeing and appointing their Abodes on the very Day in which every one should die.* You will say perhaps, that the Mistake was owing to the Press, and those Words --- *their Abodes* --- were casually dropt. But how then come we by those Phrases which are

left in both Editions of *the Judges passing Sentence in Life, and PREDICTING the Day of the Criminal's Death*, p. 213. Third Edition, p. 231? If they had the Power of *decreeing and appointing* the very Day on which every one should die, they could easily *predict* the Day of the Criminal's Death. But if they were intrusted with the Power of *decreeing and appointing* only the *Abodes* of Men in the other Life, what has this to do with PREDICTING the *Day* of the Criminals *Death*? But,

3. There is not a Word in *Plato* about PREDICTING the Day of the Criminal's Death. The Judges did indeed *foreknow it*, *νῦν γέ τροπασί*; and the Story says, that these Judges passed their Judgment *on the very Day* of Death. But they neither *predicted*, nor *decreed*, nor *appointed* it; nor does *Plato* use any Word that implies such PREDICTION. The Judges at that Time had, as the Story says, a certain *Foreknowledge* of the Day when every Man was to die: And as they had, and were to exercise a Jurisdiction either to acquit or to condemn a Man, they met with great Difficulties from false Witnesses, who were ready to testify in favour of the

Rich

Rich and Powerful: Or there were Prejudices, which warped the Judges themselves, arising from Beauty, or some kind or other of real or imaginary Perfection. To put a Stop therefore to wrong Judgments arising from these and such like Causes, Jupiter resolves to interpose: and first he puts a Stop to Men's *foreknowing* the Day of any one's Death, not to their *predicting* it, for that was foreign to the Purpose: The Judges were by their Charter to judge *on the Day* when any one was to die, and only upon *that*. When therefore their *Foreknowledge* of that Day was taken from them, their Jurisdiction must necessarily cease. But,

4. Suppose these Judges could and did PREDICT the *Day* of every Man's Death, by a strange Stretch of Fancy, Mr. Warburton interprets this thus --- *If this be so, then by predicting the Day of the Criminal's Death was meant the Infliction of a Capital Punishment.* To understand this we must go a little back, and look into a Relation of Diodorus Siculus. He tells us, "it was a Custom in Egypt for Judges to be appointed at every one's Interment to examine his past Life, and to condemn and acquit according

" to the Evidence. These Judges were of the
" Priesthood," --- and it seems " they grew
" very partial and iniquitous in process of
" time." This, says Mr. Warburton, " I
" suppose gave Birth to the general Fable.
" But there is one Circumstance which this
" does not so clearly account for, namely
" of the Judges *passing Sentence in Life and*
" PREDICTING the Day of the Criminal's
" Death." It is true it does not at all ac-
count for, what is not in *Plato*, nor any
where else. See now how strongly Imagi-
nation will work to get over an imagined
Difficulty. " To understand these things
" we must conclude, what is *very probable*,
" that the Custom mentioned by *Diodorus*
" was only the Succession of a more early
" one, where the *Priests* judged the living
" Criminal for those Crimes that the *Civil*
" *Tribunal* could not so conveniently take
" notice of:" This you see is mere *Inven-*
tion to get rid of the Difficulty. And then
follow the Words — " if this be so, then
" by predicting the Day of the Criminal's
" Death was meant the Infliction of a capital
" Punishment." First, he invents " an
" Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction with coactive
" Power,

"Power;" and then, that *coactive Power* extended to the Power of *Life and Death*; and then this imaginary *Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction* gave Birth to a *Fable* wherein no mention is made or hinted at about *Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction*, or *Priests*; and lastly what is *supposed* to be in the *Fable*, and is not, about *PREDICTING the Day of a Criminal's Death*, means, *the inflicting capital Punishment*, which likewise is not in the *Fable*, nor any thing similar to it.

One would think this *Fable*, or *fabulous Covering*, was very natural and easy: It was to tell us that all Men were accountable to God for all their Actions; and that he would not be influenced, as Men too often are, by Riches and Grandeur in favour of the Powerful, nor by Calumny and Contempt, against the Poor and Miserable: That our Souls do not die with our Bodies, but are to be rewarded and punished hereafter: That the Good and Virtuous here are to dwell in Happiness, free from all Evils: That the Vicious and Impious are to be thrust into a Place of Punishment. This might be dress'd up in *Fable*, or *Emblem*, or *Allegory*; and nothing could be more natural and easy than the Story, as it lies in *Plato*. But when this is supposed

supposed to be founded on an Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction with coactive Power ; and an Abolition of such Power by the Civil Magistrate, it is all incoherent, and all the Symmetry and Beauty of the Fable is lost.

5. What Words in *Plato* can be so perverted as to imply that he meant the Civil “*Magistrate’s Abolition of Ecclesiastical Ju-
risdiction?*” Why it seems the Fable goes on thus — *living Men passed Judgment on living Men on the Day they were to die, upon Men that had handsome Bodies, that were of high Birth, that had great Riches, and powerful Relations.* These things corrupted the Judges, and made them pass upon such as bad wicked Souls a wrong Judgment : for when the Judgment was to be, many Witnesses came for them, and witnessed for their good Life, however wicked they had been. Upon Complaint of this, Jupiter resolved to correct this Evil, and would not have either Judges or Judgment in this World, but in the next ; where a Soul could see a Soul, and both Judge and Criminal were stripp’d of all Disguise. He therefore in the first Place orders Prometheus to take away the Judges Prescience of the Day of Men’s Death which they then had.

Let

Let us now suppose the Story which *Diodorus* tells us, and which I have just now mentioned, to be true. What now is Mr. *Warburton's* Application? Why --- "If
" this be so" --- then by Prometheus's taking
" away the Gift [of Prescience] from them
[i. e. from the Judges mentioned in *Plato's*
Fable] is meant, the Civil Magistrate's Abolition
of the [Ecclesiastical] Jurisdiction. He
might as well have said, King *Henry VIII's*
Abolition of the Pope's Supremacy. For
the Fable relates as much to the one as the
other.

Lastly, His Interpretation of *Virgil's* ---
falso damnati criminis Mortis --- for the sake
of which all this seems to be introduced,
is as extraordinary as the Interpretation of
Plato's Fable. He says, it does not signify
" Men falsely condemned, but wrongly judged
" whether to *Acquittal* or *Conviction*. For
" Condemnation being oftner the Sentence
" of Justice, the greater part is put for the
" whole figuratively." p. 212, or 230. That
is, to *condemn*, may be put for to *acquit*:
by the same Figure to *hang a Man* too, may
be put for to *reprieve* or *pardon*, because
Hanging is oftner the Sentence of Justice
than

than Reprieving or Pardoning. How would one Instance, from any Author, of this Sense of the Word *condemn*, put for to *free*, or *set at Liberty*, have cleared up this Matter? Could not one Author have supplied an Instance, where *damnare* is put for *liberare*?

Mr. Warburton knows too well, not to be imposed on by any Mistakes, which a less learned Man might possibly have been led into by some Grammarians and Critics.

But enough of this. If I have shewn Mr. Warburton to have been mistaken in this Point of the *double* Doctrine of the Antients, great Part of his *Third Book* will be nothing to the Purpose.

I design in the Third Place to consider what this Learned Writer has undertaken to shew about the Nature of the *Jewish Theocracy*, and its *Duration*. Perhaps you may think that I might as well have left this Subject, till his next Volume shall appear, since in *That* He proposes to treat more largely upon this Head. But Objections to what He has already published may be of some Use, even to him; and may tend to make his further Disquisitions more accurate

tate, if evet they should appear ; and therefore I shall consider what is already in every Body's Hands.

The first Thing that struck me, upon this Subject, was his Attack upon Mr. Bayle, for what he has said about the Nature of a certain penal Law in the *Jewish* Republic. Mr. Bayle had stated the Objection thus, as Mr. Warburton gives us his Words. " The Law of *Moses* gives no Tolerance to Idolaters and false Prophets, whom it punishes with Death.--- From whence it follows, that all the Reasons I have employed in the first Part of this Commentary prove nothing, because they prove too much ; namely, that the literal Sense of the Law of *Moses*, as far as it relates to the Punishment of Opinions, would be impious and abominable. Therefore since God could, without violating the eternal Order of Things, command the *Jews* to put *false Prophets* to Death, it follows evidently, that he could, under the Gospel also, command *Orthodox Believers* to inflict the same Pnnishment upon *Heretics*." Div. Leg. Vol. II. p. 367-8.

Mr. Bayle “ ingenuously owns this Objection to be strong ;” and He declares, that He “ knows some, who have no greater Difficulties to hinder their believing, “ that God was the Author of the Laws of “ Moses, and of all those Revelations that “ occasioned so much Slaughter and Desolation, than this very Business of Intolerance, so contrary to our clearest Ideas “ of natural Equity.” *ibid.*

What now is Mr. Warburton’s Remark upon this? Why, He hints as if Mr. Bayle was “ one of those *backward Believers*, as “ by some of his Expressions he gives us “ Reason to suspect.” It is not my Design to enter into a Vindication of Mr. Bayle’s Sentiments; but yet I cannot but ask, which are those *Expressions* in this Passage, upon which Mr. Warburton is so ready to ground his *Suspicions* of Mr. Bayle’s being one of those *backward Believers*? What have personal Reflexions to do in a Case that is to be managed with Argument and Reason? But,

Mr. Bayle “ dwelt with Pleasure on this Circumstance, as he thought it favour’d his darling Scepticism,” *ibid.* Where does it appear, that he *dwelt with Pleasure*

on this *Circumstance*? Or what is the *Circumstance* he dwelt on? If it be the *Business of Intolerance*, --- Surely, he ought to be commended for dwelling on that Subject; nor ought he to be suspected of being a *backward Believer* on that Account. If the *Circumstance*, on which he dwelt with *Pleasure*, be the removing a Difficulty taken from a penal Law among the *Jews*:--- This too deserves the Commendation of every Man, Believer or not Believer, and is no Foundation for any ill *Suspicions*. Let Mr. *Bayle* have been e'er so great a *Sceptic*, nothing of that kind *here* appears: And why Mr. *Warburton* should mention this, upon Occasion of this Quotation, unless it be to raise Envy or Prejudice against the Man, whom he did not like, I cannot conceive.

It is true, that Mr. *Bayle* has here observed, “ That it seems to be a Mark of “ God’s Sovereign Pleasure, that we should “ not arrive at Certainty in any Thing, see-“ ing he has given *Exceptions* in his holy “ Word to almost all the common Notices “ of Reason,” *ibid.* I will not presume to affirm what are the *Exceptions* he had in View. This is certain, That there are Difficulties,

160 *The NATURE of the*
ficulties, which have exercised the Wits of
the Best and Truest Friends to Revelation,
and of the ablest Writers, to resolve them.
This very Subject of *Toleration*, and this
very Difficulty about the Punishment of
Idolatry with *Death*, was never cleared up,
(if you will take Mr. Warburton's Word for
it,) till Mr. *Locke* wrote his Letter upon
Toleration. But since Mr. Warburton af-
fures us, that " before he has done with In-
" fidelity, he hopes to shew, that the
" Word of God contains no *Exceptions* to
" the common Notices of Reason," *ibid.*
I shall live in hopes to see a compleat An-
swer to all those Difficulties, which hitherto
have been raised by Good and Honest
Men, and I shall heartily and sincerely
congratulate him on his successful Labors.
But let us proceed.

Mr. Warburton affirms, that " the Solu-
" tion of this Difficulty," viz. of the ca-
pital Punishment of Idolatry, " was above
" Mr. Bayle's Strength, had he been never
" so willing to reconcile Scripture to Rea-
" son. The Truth is, *Judea* was a mere
" *Terra incognita* to this great Adventurer."
Here again we want *Proof*, and not mere
Assertion;

Affection; and what Reason there is to call for it, will appear presently. He goes on;

" Our excellent Countryman Mr. *Locke*, who
" wrote about this Time on the same
" Subject,--- was much happier in his Ac-
" count of the Matter." Happy *England*,
that Mr. *Locke* was born here! His Letter concerning Toleration might have been suspected to have come from some Foreigner, since he published his Book, not in his native Language, and printed it at *Tergau*, and directed it to a *Dutch* Divine, and so put his Name to it, that a thousand may look on its Title, and not know, that it was the Work of an *English* Man, or that Mr. *Locke* wrote it. But let us see what Mr. *Locke* says.

" As to the Case of the Israelites, says he,
" in the Jewish Commonwealth, who being
" initiated into the Mosaic Rites, and made
" Citizens of the Commonwealth, did af-
" terwards apostatize from the Worship of
" the God of Israel, These were proceeded
" against as TRAYTORS and REBELS, guilty
" of no less than HIGH TREASON. For
" the Commonwealth of the Jews, different
" in That from all others, was an absolute

" THEOCRACY ; nor was there, nor could
" there be any Difference between the Com-
" monwealth and the Church. The Laws
" established there concerning the Worship of
" the one invisible Deity were the Civil Laws
" of the People, and a Part of their Politi-
" cal Government, in which God himself was
" the Legislator. This he said, and for
" aught I can learn, he was the *First* that
" said it. So that the Remark was as new
" as it was solid," p. 369.

What I would observe upon this is, First, Mr. Warburton says, that our Countryman, Mr. Locke, was the *first* that gave this Solution of this Difficulty ; and when He gave it, it was *New*. Secondly, Mr. Bayle was not able to solve it, " *it was above his Strength, had he been never so willing.*" I add, Thirdly, that " before Mr. Warburton had seen the Solution in Mr. Locke's Treatise, or knew that He, or any one else, had given it, He conceived it to be the only Answer to the Objection." *ibid.*

Now *First*, Mr. Bayle wrote his *Commentary* in the Year 1686. Mr. Locke published his Epistle concerning Toleration not till 1689, and then published it at Tergau in

in the same Country, where Mr. Bayle had published his Commentary. Consequently Mr. Bayle wrote *Three Years* before Mr. Locke. Secondly Mr. Bayle gave the very Solution that Mr. Locke gave to this Difficulty ; and consequently Mr. Locke was not the *First* that gave the true Solution of this Difficulty, nor was his Solution *New*. Thirdly, If therefore Mr. Locke's Solution was “*solid*,” and “*the only proper Answer to the Objection*;” Mr. Bayle's was as *solid* and *proper* ; and consequently again, “*this Difficulty was not above his Strength*.”

I have from Mr. Warburton transcribed Mr. Locke's Words ; it is fit to transcribe Mr. Bayle's, that You yourself may see his Solution. He has mentioned some other Considerations relating to this Difficulty, and then he proceeds thus, --- “ But wherefore, will some say, why put a Man to Death for persuading his Neighbour to worship another Divinity, which in his Judgment he believes to be true ? Because by that particular Form of Government, and in that Theocracy, under which the People of Israel liv'd, this was an *Overt-act of High Treason* ; it was

" an Attempt of *Rebellion* against the So-
" vereign Magistrate. Now, since Order
" eternal and immutable confers a Power
" on the Magistrate of punishing *Treason*
" and *Rebellion*, and whatever tends to the
" overthrowing the *Constitution*; it is plain,
" that *God being once constituted Head of the*
" Jewish Commonwealth, whoever should
" afterwards alienate his own *Allegiance*, or
" endeavour to draw others away, deserved
" to die as a *Traitor* and *Rebel*: Nor will it
" avail him, that in so doing he followed
" the Light of his Conscience; this being
" a singular Case, in which God by an
" extraordinary Appointment, viz. That of
" a *Theocratical Government* among the
" Jews, derogates from the Immunities of
" Conscience. The Crime in this Case be-
" comes punishable by the Secular Arm, in
" Quality of *Treason* and *Rebellion* against
" the State; &c."

The Point here is, only to consider these *Facts*, whether Mr. *Locke* was the *first* that gave the *true Solution* of the Difficulty, and whether his Solution was *new*, as well as *solid*; and whether the Difficulty was *above* Mr. Bayle's Strength to answer. Now Mr.

Bayle

Bayle wrote three Years before Mr. Locke. Mr. Bayle's Solution is taken from the *Theocratical Government among the Jews*: So is Mr. Locke's. In this State, says Mr. Bayle, Idolatry was *Treason and Rebellion*: Idolaters were *Traitors and Rebels*, says Mr. Locke. In that Theocracy, says Mr. Bayle, under which the People of Israel liv'd, Idolatry was an Overt-Act of High-Treason; it was an Attempt of Rebellion against the Sovereign Magistrate: Such People were guilty, says Mr. Locke, of no less than High Treason. The Crime, says Mr. Bayle, was punishable by the secular Arm in Quality of Treason and Rebellion against the State: The Worship of the One God, says Mr. Locke, was a Part of their Political Government,—the Civil Laws of the People; from whence he argues, that Idolaters were proceeded against as Traitors and Rebels. So then they Both account for this Difficulty on the very same Principles; they Both use the same Expressions; they Both resolve it into the Theocracy established among the Jews; they Both allow it to be owing to the particular Constitution of that People, in which God was the Sovereign Magistrate.: And

yet Mr. *Locke* was much happier in his Account of this Matter, than Mr. *Bayle*. Can this be owing to any thing else but this, Mr. *Locke* was our excellent Countryman, Mr. *Bayle* was not our Countryman, but was a backward Believer.

But neither was Mr. *Locke*, nor Mr. *Bayle*, the first that had published to the World this Solution of this Difficulty. Dr. *Spencer* had done it before either of them. He, in a Dissertation, which Mr. *Warburton* has treated as of little Esteem, has shewn, that God, as King of the Jews, had given Laws about the punishing Idolaters with Death,
“ utpote rebellibus et majestatis imminutæ
“ manifestis,” as Rebels, and guilty of Treason. This was published by him in the Year 1685. So that Mr. *Locke* was not the First, that gave the true Answer to the Difficulty; no not the first of even our Countrymen. And what is not a little remarkable, Dr. *Spencer* considers the wrong Use that might be made of this Law, as Mr. *Bayle* and Mr. *Locke* did after him.
“ E legibus hinc perperam colligitur, quod
“ nobis etiam in idololatras et hæreticos ferro
“ et flamma sævire liceat: nam manifestum
“ est

"est omnibus, nisi quas ζυλος πικρος, occœcavit, Israelitas leges illas a Deo accepisse,
"non quatenus Jehovah, sed quatenus Jehovah stator esset, et inter eos, instar regis
"politici, modo visibili et externo versaretur."

It is a great Mistake, says he, to conclude from these Laws, that it is lawful for Us to take away the Lives of Idolaters and Heretics; for it is manifest to all, except such as a bitter Zeal has stark blinded, that God gave the Jews those Laws, not as the God of Heaven, or Governor of the Universe, but as God their KING, and was amongst them as their POLITICAL GOVERNOR. De Theocratia Judaica, p. 254.

The Commonwealth of *Israel* was certainly different from all other Commonwealths, that either are, or ever were in the World. Their Civil Laws were given by *God*, and so were the Laws relating to their Religion and Modes of Worship. In this They were different from all other People, that no Distinction ought to be made betwixt their Civil and Ecclesiastical Laws; for in Strictness their whole Body of Laws made up one Civil Body of Institutes, whereof *God* was the proper Legislator,

who founded their Commonwealth. In all other States the Society have set up their Commonwealth; and have armed their Magistrates with Power, as they thought most necessary or useful to themselves: And, if they have thought fit to embrace the Christian Revelation, this has made no Alteration in the *Civil State*. That has gone on in its former Rout, changing, altering, repealing, adding to, its Civil Laws, without Blame, and without Censure. But amongst the *Jews* it could not be so, without rejecting God from being their King, and declaring themselves dissatisfied with the Laws which he gave them. Now a King *invisible*, being their King, they had no Opportunity or Possibility of having Access to him, or consulting with, or taking Directions from him, but in the Manner prescribed: Either they were to consult his *Oracle*; or to follow the Directions of Persons known to be *inspired* by him; or there must have been some *extraordinary Interposition*, from whence they could conclude how they were to act.

This Form of Government of the *Jews*, being properly call'd a *Theocracy*, there are

Two

Two Points, which Mr. Warburton has largely consider'd. The First is, in Relation to the Origin, Continuation, and Duration of this Theocracy. The Other is, in Relation to the Exercise of an *extraordinary Providence* over *particular Persons*, as well as over the *State* in general.

In Relation to the *Former* of these Points, He tells us, " that most Writers suppose it " to have ended with the *Judges*, but " scarce any bring it lower than the *Captivity*: On the contrary; I hold, that in " strict Truth and Propriety it ended not " till the coming of *Christ*." p. 404. Here it is, that He attacks Dr. Spencer's Dissertation on the *Jewish Theocracy*, " a Treatise by no Means in the Number of those " on which *Spencer* raised his Reputation: " He goes on a wrong Hypothesis; he " uses weak Arguments; and he is confounded, and inconsistent in his Assertions."

p. 414.

Are we not now from hence to imagine, that Dr. *Spencer* was one of those Writers that supposed the Theocracy to have ended with the *Judges*, or at furthest with the *Captivity*? And yet Mr. *Warburton* is forced

to own, that *Spencer* “supposes,” [I say He positively *asserts*] “that some obscure Foot-
steps of it remained to the Time of *Christ*;” yes, and longer too, for his Words are, *ad extrema usque Politice sua tempora*, i.e. quite to the last Times of their Polity, even to the last Times of expiring Judaism.

But supposing Dr. *Spencer* to be somewhat “confused and inconsistent” in his Account of the Theocracy; Surely he is pardonable, since he tells us, that *Nobody had before enter'd fully into that Affair: if any had touch'd upon it, it was only by the by*. Let us see if Mr. *Warburton* be more clear and consistent in his Account of this Matter.

His first Charge against him is, That He thought the Theocracy was established by Degrees, and abrogated by Degrees. A “Conceit highly absurd, says Mr. *Warburton*, as God was Legislator.” p. 415. But wherein lies the Absurdity of this *Gradual Progress* and *Gradual Declension*, even in Cases where God was Legislator? I suppose he will say, that the Theocracy began at the Instant of the *Horeb Covenant*; and not when the Children of *Israel* were delivered from *Egypt*, and were first under the immediate

mediate Protection of God. But Spencer intended by his Word *Theocracy*, all the Time that the *Jews* were under the direct Power and immediate Dominion of God; which certainly began at the Deliverance of the *Jews* from *Egypt*, and was compleated in the highest and fullest Sense, at the *Horeb* Covenant, when God was constituted their *King*.

So when Dr. Spencer speaks of its *de-clining gradually*,—of the *Government of God* being *lessened*,—of its making a *nigher Approach to its ceasing*; I think, if there be an *Absurdity or Inconsistency* in this Manner of speaking, it may be justified by Mr. Warburton's own Authority. He himself tells us, that “indeed in the Period immediately preceding their [the *Jews*] Captivity, on the *gradual withdrawing* the extraordinary Providence from them,—they began to entertain Doubts concerning God's further peculiar Regard to them, *as his chosen People.*” p. 400. So that he here expressly owns a *GRADUAL WITHDRAWING* of the *extraordinary Providence* from the *Jews*. And where is the *Absurdity* of Dr. Spencer's *gradual Declension*, or *Imminution* of

172 *The NATURE of the*
of the Theocracy, which Mr. Warburton's
GRADUAL WITHDRAWING of the extraor-
dinary Providence is not liable unto? Or
was not the gradual withdrawing of the ex-
traordinary Providence, a proper Imminution
of the Theocracy? Dr. Spencer conceived,
that this gradual Declension of the Theocracy
began in the *Israelites* Demand of a King;
that it was more lessen'd when God called
Saul and *David* to the Head of Affairs; that
under *Solomon* it became nearer to its Cef-
sation. And in Proof of this he urges the
Disuse of the *Urim* and *Thummim*, and such
other Arguments as shew'd there was not
such frequent Interpositions of an *extraordi-*
nary Providence, as were under the *Judges*,
or in *Joshua's*, or in *Moses's* Days: At the
same time he contends, that some obscure
Footsteps of it continued to the last Times
of their State. Now Mr. Warburton hath
not shewn, that the *gradual Declension* of
the Theocracy did not begin, when Spencer
says it did; but only that it did not cease at
the Time when Spencer said it began to *de-*
cline. And since he owns, that there was a
gradual withdrawing of the *extraordinary*
Providence before the Captivity, he must
own

own a gradual Imminution, even whilst God's Viceroy continued upon his Throne: And what will be the Absurdity or Inconsistency in *Spencer*, that he himself is not liable unto? But,

2. I must observe further, Dr. *Spencer* maintains, "that some obscure Footsteps of the Theocracy remained even to the Time of Christ." And Mr. *Warburton* holds, that it "ended not till the coming of Christ." p. 404, 417. Dr. *Spencer* is consistent: But it is far from being clear, that Mr. *Warburton* is so. For He hath told us, that in the Period, immediately preceding the Captivity, there was a gradual withdrawing of the extraordinary Providence. p. 400. In another Place he tells us, that "after their perfect Settlement, on their Return from Captivity, (when we know from the Course and Progress of God's Oeconomy, the extraordinary Providence would cease,) we hear no more of it amongst them, nor did they make the least Pretence to it, tho' they now adhered much more strictly to their Religion, than they had ever done before. They pretended not,-- to either Prophets,

"Oracles

"Oracles, or extraordinary Dispensations," p. 440. Here Mr. Warburton mentions the Misfortune at "*Bethsura*; caused by the "Sabbatical Year; a Misfortune, of which "we have no Instance before the Captivity, and therefore a plain Proof, that the "extraordinary Providence was indeed withdrawn." p. 440. Again; "The extraordinary Providence kept gradually decaying, till on their full Settlement after their Return it ENTIRELY CEASED."

P. 445.

From these Assertions of Mr. Warburton I argue, 1. That if the Extraordinary Providence ENTIRELY CEASED, on the full Settlement of the Jews, after their Return, it ceased some Centuries at least before the Days of Christ; and consequently the Theocracy must have ceased some Centuries before the Days of Christ. How then is Mr. Warburton more consistent about the Duration of the Theocracy than Others are, since he pleads for its Continuance till Christ's Time, and yet maintains, that it entirely ceased so long before his Time? And, 2. The Affair of *Bethsura* seems to intimate, that God did not give to the Jews a double Portion of Corn,

Corn, or of the Fruits of the Earth, the Year before the Year of rest ; for they were forced to make Peace with *Antiochus*, because *they had no Victuals there to endure the Siege*, it being a Year of rest to the Land, 1 Macc. vi. 49. Now God had promised his Blessing upon them in the Sixth Year, that it should bring forth Fruit for three Years, Lev. xxv. 21. The People therefore wanting Victuals at *Bethsura* in the Sabbatical Year, it may seem probable, that the immediate extraordinary Providence was then ceased ; or else they would not have been forced to submit to their Enemies for *Want of Victuals*, that Year more than another. I only argue with Mr. Warburton, that it may seem probable, that the extraordinary Providence had at that Time entirely ceased : And if so, then it had ceased 183 Years before *Christ* at least. The Point then is to prove, that notwithstanding this entire Cessation, yet it continued so long, as Mr. Warburton tells us, it did continue.

3. Mr. Warburton taxes Dr. Spencer with Absurdity, for maintaining, that “ the first Step to the Abrogation ” of the Theocracy “ was the *Israelites* Demand of a King : “ that

" that it was more impaired when *Saul* and
" *David* got Possession of the Throne :
" that it approached much nearer its End,
" when it became hereditary under *Salomon* ;
" and yet for all this, that some obscure
" Footsteps of it remained even to the Time
" of *Christ.*" p. 415.

Let us now consider Mr. *Warburton's* own
Words thirty Pages off. He is speaking of
the GRADUAL WITHDRAWING of the ex-
traordinary Providence. " Under the *Judges*,
" says he, it was perfectly equal. And du-
" ring that Period of the Theocracy, it is
" remarkable we hear of no Complaints
" at all. When the People had rebelliously
" demanded a *King*, and their Folly was so
" far complied with, that God suffered
" the *Theocracy* to be administer'd by a
" Viceroy, there was as was fitting, a great
" ABATEMENT in the Vigour of this ex-
" traordinary Providence, partly in natural
" Consequence, God being further removed
" from the immediate Administration; part-
" ly in Punishment of their Rebellion. And
" soon after this, it is that we first find them
" beginning to make their Remarks and
" Complaints of Inequality. From hence
" to

" to the time of the *Captivity*, the extraordinary Providence kept GRADUALLY DECAYING; till on their full Settlement, " after their return; it entirely ceased." p.
" 445.

What now is the Difference betwixt these two Great Men? Dr. Spencer has dated *the Abatement* of the Theocracy from the *End* of the Times of the *Judges*: Mr. Warburton allows that " Under *the Judges* " it was perfectly equal." Dr. Spencer says, that the Theocracy suffered some Imminution under *David* and *Solomon*: Mr. Warburton says, " When the People demanded " a King --- there was a great *Abatement* " in the Vigour of this *Extraordinary Providence*." At last Mr. Warburton owns a TOTAL CESSATION upon the return of the Jews from Captivity; and to the time of the Captivity a GRADUAL DECAY: Dr. Spencer says, there was a *Gradual Imminution* of the Theocracy; but as for a TOTAL CESSATION before Christ's time, he was not inconsistent enough to maintain That.

4. I cannot but observe, that Mr. Warburton asserts, and seems to know *a priori*, that the Extraordinary Providence would cease;

cease, a great many Ages before Christ; and notwithstanding this, he maintains that the *Theocracy* was to continue till the Days of Christ. His Words are, what I in part have cited already, but which I must again repeat.

" After their perfect Settlement on their
" return from Captivity, *when we know*
" *from the Course and Progress of God's Oecono-*
" *momy, the extraordinary Providence would*
" *cease, &c.*" p. 440. How does Mr. War-
burton know from the *Course and Progress of*
God's Oeconomy, that at that time the extra-
ordinary Providence WOULD cease? Did
God ever discover beforehand, that it should
cease after their Return and Settlement in
their own Land? Or by what Rule does he
form a Judgment, that what was GRADU-
ALLY DECAYING to the Captivity, was en-
tirely to cease after their Return and full Set-
tlement; and yet was to continue till
Christ's time, even some Hundred of Years
after their full Settlement? I fear Mr. War-
burton has pronounced a certain Knowledge,
where he has not sufficient Principles to
reason on.

He owns, that the extraordinary Prov-
idence "was long ceased," when the Au-
thor

thor of *Ecclesiasticus* lived. p. 439. And whilst the Jews were out of their own Land; it was impossible that they should observe the *Laws* of their King: He had given them up to Captivity; and in course the whole Frame of their Republic was disjointed, if not perfectly dissolved during those *Seventy Years*. When They returned into their own Land, and to their national Laws and Constitutions, and were settled; there does not seem to be any Return, or at least Continuance of an Extraordinary Providence. For the Oracle of God ceased; Prophecy and Prophets soon ceased; the promised Blessing of the Sabbatical Year ceased; in short, the Jews then began to form a Plan of their own, they mingled up with the Law given by God, an heterogeneous Composition of Human Laws, which were more observed by many than the Law of God when *Christ* appeared; and which he condemned as so many Additions; the Observance of which would not entitle them to any extraordinary Blessings.

But I am not enquiring into the *Causes* of the *extraordinary Providence* ceasing, but into the *Fact* itself. It had ceased some

180 *The NATURE of the*
hundred of Years before *Christ* came; as
Mr. *Warburton* over and over confesses.
The Difficulty then is to shew that the *Theo-*
crapy continued, or “ended not till the
“coming of *Christ*.” p. 404.

Perhaps Mr. *Warburton* will distinguish
between the ceasing of the *Theocracy*, and
the ceasing of the *Extraordinary Providence*: He may say, that the *Theocracy* con-
tinued till the *coming of Christ*; the *Extra-*
ordinary Providence entirely ceased at the
full Settlement after the return of the *Jews*
from their Captivity. Let us then grant that
the *Theocracy* “revived after the return from
“the Captivity,” as he tells us p. 416.
And that “that Dispensation of Providence
soon ceased after the Re-establishment.”
ibid. We are still as much in the Dark as
ever; nor will this Distinction help the
Matter, or free Mr. *Warburton* from great
self-Contradiction. For He tells us, “one
“NECESSARY consequence [of a *Theocracy*]”
“was an EXTRAORDINARY PROVIDENCE.”
For the Affairs of a People under a *Theo-*
crapy being administred “by GOD as KING;
“and his peculiar and immediate Admini-
“stration in human Affairs being what we
“call

" call an *Extraordinary Providence*, it follows that an Extraordinary Providence must NEEDS be exercised over such a People. My Meaning is, that if the Jews were really under a *Theocracy*, they were really under an *Extraordinary Providence*. ----In a Word, they must be either both true or both false, but still *inseparable*.

" p. 419.

If this be the Case, then it is plain that a *Theocracy* cannot be without an *Extraordinary Providence*. But then Mr. Warburton has shewn, and at large insists upon it, that the *Extraordinary Providence* ENTIRELY CEASED several hundred Years before Christ's coming: Nay he says, that he "knows from the Course and Progress of God's Oeconomy, that the Extraordinary Providence WOULD cease at the full Settlement of the Jews after their return from the Captivity." p. 440. He has likewise proved by several Arguments, that the *Theocracy* continued even to the coming of Christ." p. 417, 418. By this means we are left in inextricable Difficulties: For First, we have a *Theocracy* subsisting many hundred Years without an *extraordinary Providence*, viz. from the Settlement

of the Jews, after their return, to the time of Christ: And consequently, Secondly, a *Theocracy* wherein an *Extraordinay Providence* NEEDS not be exercised. Thirdly, We have a *Theocracy* without a NECESSARY CONSEQUENCE of a *Theocracy*, i. e. without an extraordinary Providence. And whereas he asserts that “the *Theocracy* and “extraordinary *Providence*, must be either “Both true or Both false, but still inseparable,” He himself has shewn them to be separable, by shewing that the one did in fact subsist without the other for so many hundred Years, as were between the Settlement of the Jews after their return from Captivity and the coming of Christ.

Mr. Warburton’s second Objection against Dr. Spencer is, “in his *Arguments for the Abolition of the Theocracy*, instead of attempting to prove it on the great Principles of Civil Policy, the only way of determining the Question with certainty, he insists much on the Disuse of *Urim* and *Thummim*, &c. He brings the Despotic Power of the Kings, as another Argument, which I think proves the very contrary. For were these Kings the Viceroyes of God,

" God, whose Power was despotic, their's
" must necessarily be the same; not so, if
" Monarchs in their own Right." p. 415.

" In his Arguments for the *Abolition of the Theocracy*?" --- Has Dr. Spencer any Arguments for the *Abolition* of the Theocracy before the Days of Christ? He has no such Arguments; nor I dare say never thought of such a Topic; because he tells us that it continued *to the last times of their Polity*. He has indeed a Section about the *Duration* of the Theocracy, in which he lays down four Theses, about the *gradual declining* of the Theocracy: And in one of them, he shews that it was not at an End in *Saul* and *David's* Days, because in their time the *divine Oracle* was consulted: that in *Solomon's* time, there was a Disuse of the Oracle of *Urim* and *Thummim*, which was the most eminent Pledge and Indication of the divine Government: from this he concludes it nearer *ἀπαντοῦσα*, to a disappearing. But since he allows it to continue for a thousand or eleven hundred Years after this, how is it possible for him to bring Arguments for the *Abolition* of the Theocracy from the Disuse of *Urim* and *Thummim*? He could mean only an *Abatement*.

2. Suppose he uses an Argument taken from the *Despotic Power* of the *Jewish Kings*. --- Is this to prove an *Abolition* of the Theocracy, which he owns to have continued to the End of the *Jewish Polity*? A *Despotic Power* in a King governing all things by his *own Will* and Pleasure, is quite a different thing from an absolute Power delegated by God to his *Viceroy*: This must always be directed by Truth, Justice and Goodness; whereas the other is, or may be, what cannot be delegated by God, nothing but Humour, Caprice and Fancy. Dr. *Spencer* therefore never brings an Argument from the *Despotic Power* of their Kings to prove an *Abolition* of the Theocracy, but an *Imminution*, a *lessening* of it, a *Declension* of it. God *might*, and Dr. *Spencer* thinks that, He *did*, not so visibly shew himself the *immediate King and Governor of Israel*, after *Solomon's Days*, as he did before: And he imagines that this appears from certain Circumstances in and after those Times, where these *Viceroy*s made use of a Despotic Power, not according to Truth and Uprightness. But as to a *total Cessation*, or as Mr. *Warburton* calls it, an *Abolition* of the Theocracy, Dr.

Spencer

Spencer is not so inconsistent as to suppose it to *continue* to *Christ's* time at least, and yet to plead that it *totally ceased* either a thousand or five hundred Years before that time.

The *Third* Objection of Mr. *Warburton* is, that though Dr. *Spencer* in one Place “supposes a *gradual decay* of the Theocracy, and that even some obscure Footsteps of it remained to the time of *Christ*, yet in the following Section he all the way argues upon the Supposition of an absolute and entire *Abrogation*, by the establishment of the Kings.” p. 416.

Here again is Dr. *Spencer* much misrepresented, from not considering what he meant by the *Abrogation* of God's *Government*. Not that the Theocracy entirely *ceased*; but the Government received an Alteration and Abatement. And therefore he uses more than once the Phrase of, *regiminis mutati*, in this very Section, and tells us, that when the *Israelites* desired a King — *bac in re Deus ab arte regis politici non recessit*. *God did not recede from the Art of a Political Governor*, but consented to their Requests in order to avoid a greater Evil. Where is the Absurdity or Inconsistency of this way of Reasoning, unless *Abrogation* is made

186 *The NATURE of the*
made to signify a total Abolition; and Duration is construed to be Ceſſation?

But let me now proceed to the *Second Point*, which relates to the Exercise of an extraordinary Providence over *Particular Persons* as well as over the *State* in general.

The Scripture Representation of the *Theocracy*, as Mr. *Warburton* assures us, “ was, “ 1. Over the *State* in general: And 2. Over “ *private Men* in particular.” p. 434. I have no Doubts about the former of these Cases: For where a *Law* was given by God, and He condescended to become the *King* of a Nation; and a solemn Covenant was enter’d into by the People, and by God, as their King; and where Blessings were solemnly promised upon Obedience to the Law, or Curses were denounced upon Disobedience; and this by one who was *able* to execute whatever he engaged; no doubt can be about the reciprocal Obligations, or about God’s performing his part of the Obligation, since it is his property not to *lie nor deceive*. Temporal Rewards and Punishments being then the *Sanction* of the *Jewish Law*, these must be dispensed by God so as to make the *State* happy and flourishing if they kept the

the Law, or else miserable if they disobey'd it. If they observed, and did all the Commandments, which God commanded them, God had engaged to make them *high above all Nations, which he had made, in Praise, and in Name, and in Honour*; and if *Enemies rose up against them, the Lord would cause them to be smitten.* On the other hand, if they grew negligent of their Law, or *went aside from any of the Words commanded them, --- to serve other Gods,* then the Lord was to send *Cursing, Vexation, and Rebuke in all thou settest thine Hand unto for to do, until thou be destroy'd, and until thou perish quickly.* The Blessings and the Curses were *general, and national, agreeable to the Character of a King, and to a Legal Administration:* Such as related to them as a *People;* and not to *Particular Persons.*

The Question then that now is to be consider'd is, Whether an *Extraordinary Providence* was administer'd to Particulars, in such manner, that “ *no Transgressor escaped Punishment; nor any Observer of the Law missed his Reward.*” This was the State of the Jews under an *Equal Providence*, as Mr. Warburton tells us, p. 432, and by this

this Means, "human Affairs might be kept
" in good Order without the Doctrine of a
" future State of Rewards and Punish-
" ments."

That God did bless *Particular Persons*, amongst the *Jews*, as well as now he does, in all Nations, is certain: but that he so dispensed his Favours, as that "no Observer
" of the Law missed his Reward, nor did
" any Transgressor escape Punishment," is far from being clear. The *Nation*, consider'd as a *Nation*, had this peculiar to it, that when *they did Evil in the Sight of the Lord*, *they were deliver'd into the Hands of their Enemies*: When they repented, and *put away the strange Gods from among them, and served the Lord*, they were deliver'd. Instances of this are frequent in the Book of *Judges*, and in the History of the Kings of *Israel*. But if we descend to an extraordinary Providence over *Particulars*, even in those Times, I do not remember what will amount to Proof. Soon after these Times,
" the Sacred Writers themselves frequently
" speak of the Inequality of Providence to
" *Particulars*, in such a Manner as Men
" living under a *common Providence*, are
" accustomed

" accustomed to speak." p. 442-3. They complain of the Prosperity of the Wicked, and the ill Success of Good Men: Nay sometimes They say, *All Things come alike to all: there is one Event to the righteous and wicked, to the good and clean, and to the unclean; to him that sacrificeth, and to him that sacrificeth not: As is the Good, so is the Sinner, and he that sweareth, as he that feareth an Oath,* Eccles. ix. 2. If we go up higher to David's Days, Asaph says, *My Feet were almost gone,---I saw the Prosperity of the Wicked: They are not in the Trouble of other Men, neither are they plagued with other Men. Therefore Pride compasseth them about as a Chain, Violence covereth them as a Garment.*—Behold these are the Ungodly who prosper in the World, they increase in Riches. Psal. xxiii. 2-12. Jeremiah's Complaint is so strong, that it is unconceivable how he should make it, were an extraordinary Providence over Particulars exerted. *Righteous art thou, O Lord, when I plead with thee, yet let me talk with thee of thy Judgments: Wherefore doth the Way of the Wicked prosper? Wherefore are all they happy that deal very treacherously?*

Thou

Thou hast planted them, yea, they have taken Root; they grow, yea, they bring forth Fruit; thou art near in their Mouth, and far from their Reins. Jer. xii. 1, 2. If from these, and such general Complaints among the Sacred Writers, one descends to particular Cases; --- Whence was it that *Josiah* was slain e'er he was forty Years old, when *like unto him there was no King before him, that turned to the Lord with all his Heart, and with all his Soul, and with all his Might, according to all the Law of Moses, neither after him arose there any like him,* 2 King. xxiii. 25. And in much earlier Days, when *Solomon* had forsaken God, and worshipped *Ashstoreth, Chemosh, and Milcom*, yet He was continued *Prince all the Days of his Life*, and the Kingdom was taken out of his Son's Hands, to be given to *Jeroboam*, 1 King. xi. 33, 35. a Prince that was as Idolatrous and Wicked, or more so, than ever was *Solomon* himself. And if we go up higher still, to those early Days, when all agree, that the Theocracy was in its full Force, when *Achan* had stolen the *Wedge of Gold, and had sinned against the Lord God of Israel*, the Forces of *Joshua* were smitten

smitten before the Men of *Ai*. The Crime was *Achan's* alone, but the Punishment fell on the discomfited Army of *Israel*.

This Objection, taken from the Complaints made by the Sacred Writers, was so full and strong, that tho' Mr. *Warburton* promises to prove hereafter that an equal Providence was actually administer'd, yet for his Readers *present Satisfaction*, He would shew, that "these Representations of *Inequality* are very *consistent* with that before given of the *Equality* of Providence." p. 443. I will examine, with as much Brevity as I can, what he has said; and leave you to judge, whether he has said enough to give his Reader *present Satisfaction*.

First, He says, "That when the Sacred Writers speak of the *Inequality* of Providence, and the unfit Distribution of Things, they sometimes mean that State of it amongst their *Pagan Neighbours*, and not in *Judea*; as particularly in the Book of *Psalms* and *Ecclesiastes*." p. 443.

Asaph, or whoever was the Author of the *Psalms* before cited, complains heavily, and was almost stagger'd at the Prosperity of the

the wicked. These wicked Men were not; it seems, Jews, but their *Pagan Neighbours*: He then that lived under an *equal Providence*, where the Wicked were constantly punished and the Good as constantly rewarded, was almost lost, when he consider'd, that where there was *no equal Providence*, there the Wicked were prosperous; and the Good suffer'd. Did He not know the Difference betwixt *Israel*, and its Neighbours? Was not God the *King of Israel*? And did he stand in that Relation to other Nations? How then could he be surprised so much at the Prosperity of the Wicked in the Heathen World? But supposing him to consider God, as eminently *Good to Israel*; as the *King* and *Governor* of it, then He might well wonder at the Prosperity of the *Wicked* among God's People; and his Wonder might be much greater than it usually has been in the World, where this Difficulty has been made a common Objection against Providence.

But let us examine the Psalm itself. *Truly God is Good to Israel*: Much in the same Manner says *Jeremiah*, *Righteous art thou, O Lord*. This is a Principle so certain,
that

that it can never be given up; let what Difficulties soever be raised. Then the *Psalmist* goes on; *As for me, my Feet were almost gone, --- for I envied the foolish, --- those who acted as if there were no God, --- I saw the Prosperity of the Wicked.* Could the *Psalmist*, under the immediate Providence of God, and reaping the Benefits of his Goodness upon Mr. Warburton's Scheme, *envy the foolish Heathen?* For what should he envy them? Was not he as happy in the Enjoyment of the good Things of Life, as they were? He goes on to describe their Prosperity, and Wantonness, and Slight of God, or his Knowledge; --- And then says, *Verily I have cleansed my Heart in vain, and washed my Hands in Innocency.* v. 13. How so? Does every particular Wicked Man among the Gentiles increase in Riches, grow great and powerful, and have more than Heart can wish? No surely. This is not universally true among the Heathen, more than it was among the Jews: But some certain Persons that were wicked, prospered in the World: But whether they were Jews or Heathens, the *Psalmist* has not hitherto declared. But that they were Jews appears

from what follows. *If I say, I will speak thus, viz.* that I have cleansed my Heart in vain,--- *I should offend against the Generation of thy Children*: I should give just Offence to them, by publishing so injurious a Falsehood among thy People. What then does the *Psalmist* resolve on? Why, to go into the *Sanctuary of God*, and thence to learn this Secret, and there to learn the *End* of such Men. *Thou castedst them into Destruction, surely thou didst set them in slippery Places: How are they brought into Desolation, as in a Moment? They are utterly consumed with Terrors, &c.* How would he have offended against the *Jews*, by publishing, that there was an *Unequal Providence* among their *Ragan Neighbours*? Would the Consequence have been, that Then the *Jews* might live wickedly, and yet prosper in the World? How would this follow, when the *Jews* knew that God was their *King*, and that *every Transgressor* would be *punished*, *every good Man* would be *rewarded*? Whereas, if you suppose that the *Psalmist* speaks of *Jews*, wicked *Jews* that prosper'd in the World, all is easy; and He only raises the common Objection against *Providence*,

JEWISH THEOCRACY consider'd. 195
vidence, aggravated indeed from the Consideration of the Theocracy, and tells us what gave him Satisfaction upon so nice a Subject.

Much less still is the Reflection of the Preacher in *Ecclesiastes* design'd to relate to his *Pagan* Neighbours. It is an Universal Observation, that the *Work of God* is inscrutable even to a *Wise Man*. On which Account the Author proposes to declare, that no Man could judge of either *Love* or *Hatred* by what was before him, since *all Things come alike to all, there is one Event to the righteous, and to the wicked, &c.* This was an Evil among all Things done under the Sun, that there is one Event to all. Has he made any Exception for *Israel*? No: But he maintains, that the *Race is not to the Swift; nor the Battle to the Strong; neither yet Bread to the Wise; nor yet Riches to Men of Understanding; nor yet Favour to Men of Skill; but Time and Chance happeneth to them all.* Eccles. ix. 11. Could a Wise Man, under an *Extraordinary Providence* himself, talk in this Manner, thus Universally, and make no Exceptions for his own Nation? Did he not see a *Difference* betwixt the

People of *Israel*; and all other People? Or if there was such a Difference, as Mr. *Warburton* contends for, could he fail taking Notice of it? Would not his own People be led into wrong Notions by such universal Assertions? I cannot therefore but think, that this Solution given by Mr. *Warburton* is not only not sufficiently well grounded, but that it has no Foundation at all, viz. that the *Psalmyt*, and the *Son of David*, spoke of their *Pagan Neighbours*, and not of the *Jews*, when they expressed themselves so strongly about the Prosperity of the Wicked, and the Misfortune of good Men.

Mr. *Warburton* has given us a second Solution of this Difficulty, no better, I think, than the former. "We sometimes find
" particular Men complaining of Inequalities
" in Events, which were indeed the Effects
" of a most equal Providence. Such as
" the Punishment of Posterity for the Crimes
" of their Forefathers; and of Subjects for
" their Kings." p. 443.

These are indeed remarkable Instances of an extraordinary equal Providence, where
" no Transgressor could escape Punishment,
" nor Good Man escape Reward," to tell

tell us of *transgressing Forefathers* escaping, and their *innocent Children* being *punished*; of *wicked Kings* under no Misfortunes, and *innocent Subjects* suffering on their Account! What is the Difference betwixt an *Equal*, and an *Unequal Providence*, if Good Children are *punished* for bad Fathers, or good Subjects for bad Kings? How is this to be reconciled to Justice, or Goodness, or Impartiality in an *extraordinary Providence*? Or what is an *extraordinary Providence*, but the Display of Rewards and Punishments here, according to the Merit or Demerit, the good or ill Behaviour of *particular Persons*? It is thus, that Mr. *Warburton* has defined it, and this is what He contends for. *David's Question*, which Mr. *Warburton* here mentions,---*But these Sheep, what have they done,* --- will require another Answer, when an immediate and peculiar Administration of God is supposed, than to say, that "the Subjects were punished for their " King." Where there is no *Guilt*, there can be no *Punishment* due; and if Kings act wickedly, and their Subjects are innocent, how can the Subjects be punished, or even suffer, in a State where Rewards and

Punishments are supposed to be fitly and equally dispensed? This would be punishing *Innocence*, and letting the *Guilty* not suffer: It would be transferring Guilt, which can never be the “*Effect of the most equal Providence.*” If *David* sinned, *David* ought to suffer for it, and not his innocent Subjects, his innocent *Sheep*; that no Ways were concerned. And if the Consequences of such an Administration as that of a Theocracy are such, that the Innocent must be involved in the Crimes of the Guilty, nay are punished for the Guilty, it seems impossible to find out a Difference betwixt an equal and an unequal Providence.

Mr. Warburton has observed,--- “that the great Purpose of his Work is to prove, that the *Mosaic Religion* wanting a Doctrine of a future State of Rewards and Punishments, the *Jews* MUST really have enjoy’d that equal Providence under which Holy Scripture represents them to have lived. And then, *no Transgressor escaping Punishment, nor any Observer of the Law missing his Reward,* human Affairs might be kept in good Order, without the Doctrine of a future State of Rewards

"wards and Punishments." p. 452. The Difficulty instantly occur'd, that the Law had expressly declared, that God would in certain Cases *visit the Sins of the Fathers upon the Children unto the third and fourth Generation.* Here the *innocent* Children are made to suffer for their *fanning* Parents; and this seems to be a direct Contradiction to the Law of an Equal Providence, where *no Transgrefſor could escape Punishment*, nor any *Observers of the Law could miss their Reward.*

To get rid of this Difficulty, He observes, "That the Violence of irregular Passions would make some Sort of Men, of stronger Complexions, superior to all the Fear of *personal Temporal Evil.*" Yes, and to the Fear of all *personal Future Evils* too, as daily Experience shews. But what if they were of such audacious, violent Spirits? Are there no *personal temporal Evils* sufficient to make them sensible of their Folly? Would not Sicknesſes, Diseases, Calamities, Distresses of many kinds, instantly and constantly inflicted, make them feel and own the Hand that laid them on? Or would not instant *Death* put an End to their Wicked-

Wickedness? But instead of this, which should seem the Way of an *Equal Providence*, where no Transgressor was to escape, Mr. Warburton tells us, " That to lay hold " of these [viz. who were superior to personal temporal Evils] and to gain a due " Ascendant over the most determined, " the Punishments, in this Institution, are " extended to the *Posterity* of wicked Men, " which the instinctive Fondness of Parents " to their Offspring would make terrible to " those who have hardened themselves into " an Infensibility of personal Punishments."

P. 453.

But be these hardened Wretches ever so insensible of *personal* Punishments,---Must the *innocent* Posterity of these miserable, obstinate Offenders be visited for them, in an Institution, where *no Transgressor* is to *escape* Punishment, and *no Observer* of the Law is to *miss* his Reward? Will it not always be asked,---*But these Sheep, what have they done?* Why are they to miss their Reward, when they have not transgressed, but are only unhappily descended from a transgressing Parent three or four Generations ago?

It

It is certain that the instinctive Fondness of Parents to their Offspring is oftentimes so great, that the fears of their Children's Sufferings will very much restrain them from the pursuit of irregular Passions; and make them observe the Laws of their Country, and not engage in Practices detrimental to the public Weal. And on this account in all Countries the Effects and Consequences of some Punishments of Parents are extended to their Posterity: And the Civil Law that establishes such Penalties is very just and natural, as it makes Men forfeit Honours and Estates, and whatever Privileges should descend to Children. But this is not the case in Hand. The previous Supposition is, that "no *Transgressor* is to *escape Punishment*, and *every Observer* of the Law is "never to *miss his Reward.*" The Question then is, upon *this Supposition*, How a guilty Parent's Crimes can ever be visited upon his innocent Children to the third or fourth Generation? It is no Answer, either to talk of "instinctive Fondness in Parents," or the usual Practice in all Nations, that the Titles and Estates of Rebels shall not descend to their Posterities. The case in

in debate is, *the visiting the Iniquities of the Fathers upon the innocent Children*, at the same time, that Iniquity cannot escape, nor Innocency be punished.

It is allowed to be in many Instances a grievous Affliction to Parents to have their Children involved in their Crimes. And therefore the better to keep Subjects in Obedience to the Laws, it is very usual to extend to Posterity the Consequences of a Parent's Crimes. But the present Point is, how this can be done consistent with an *equal* Providence. The Laws of Men cannot be so made, or executed, as not to bear hard on Others besides Offenders; and the unhappy Few who happen to be Sufferers must sit contented under their Difficulties for the Sake of the whole. But where an Extraordinary Providence is supposed, and Innocence is a sure Protection, and Wickedness is attended with certain Suffering, the Reverse of this cannot be put in Practice without Contradiction, *i. e.* without destroying that *Equal* Providence, which is all along pre-supposed.

He goes on and observes, "that this Punishment [of visiting the Iniquities of Fathers

" Fathers upon Children] was only to supply the want of a future State." *ibid.* But how will this "extraordinary Oeconomy" supply this Want? The Children at present suffer for their Parents Crimes; and are supposed to be punished when they have no Guilt. Is not this a plain act of Hardship? And if there be no future State, no Compensation made, the Hardship done must continue for ever a Hardship to the unhappy Sufferer. So that to supply the want of a future State, Innocence is made to suffer at present, even in a State where *Innocence* cannot fail of a Reward. A sad Supply of so great a Good!

Mr. Warburton had before him the Practice "of modern States in attaint of Blood and Confiscation," and he allows this to be done with the highest *Equity*: and says, "thus it must needs be under a *Theocracy*; God supported the *Israelites* in *Judea* by an extraordinary Administration of his Providence: The Consequence of which was great temporal Blessings given them on Condition, and to which they had no natural Claim. Could any thing therefore be more equitable, than on the Violation

“ of that *Condition* to withdraw those *extraordinary* Blessings from the Children of a Father thus offending ?” p. 457-8.

It is true, that the *Jews* had *no natural Claim* to great temporal Blessings. But then they had a Claim to them from express *Promise*, which is as good a Claim in the present Case as any natural Claim whatever. They had this Claim indeed “on Condition;” A Condition of certain Behaviour, which if they complied with, no Observer was to *miss his Reward*. The case is put of an *innocent Child* suffering on account of a *guilty Father*. The innocent Child has a right to *temporal Blessings* by virtue of express *Promise*; and no Sin of the Father can deprive him of these Blessings without a Violation of the Covenant: For if it would, an *Observer* of the Law would *miss his Reward*. It would therefore in the present Case be so far from “equitable to withdraw those extraordinary Blessings from the Children of an offending Parent,” that it would be a direct Violation of Contract, and Engagement: it would be a Breach of Promise in God, and consequently a thing impossible in itself.”

The

The *Third Solution* of this Difficulty, viz.

" That the sacred Writers themselves frequently speak of the *Inequality* of Providence to *Particulars*," does not at all clear up the Matter; nay, I cannot but think, that it involves us in greater Difficulties, and shews how much perplexed this Nation is. It stands thus. " Admitting the reality of an *equal* Providence to *Particulars* in the *Hebrew State*, the Administration of it MUST NEEDS be attended with such Circumstances, as sometimes to occasion those Observations of *Inequality*."

p. 444. i. e. in plain Terms, an *equal* Providence MUST NEEDS be observed to be *Unequal*. Is not this a plain Acknowledgment, that an *equal* Providence cannot be administered at all, since it must NEEDS be attended with such Circumstances as must appear *unequal*? But the Instances he brings to solve this Difficulty are so many clear Proofs against the thing itself. For,

i. " It appears, says he, from the *Reason of the thing*, that this Administration did not begin to be exerted in particular Cases, till the Civil Laws of the Republic had fail'd of their Efficacy. Thus, where any Crime,

“ Crime, as for Instance, Disobedience to
“ Parents, was *public*, it became the Object
“ of the Civil Tribunal, and is accordingly
“ ordered to be punished by the Judge.
“ But when *private* and secret, then it be-
“ came the Object of divine Vengeance.”

Let this be admitted. Now, says Mr. *War-*
burton, “ the *Consequence* of this was, that
“ when the Laws were *remissly* or corruptly
“ administred, Good and Ill *would sometimes*
“ happen *unequally* to Men.”

On the Contrary, I say, that this is no
Consequence at all: For upon Supposition
of an extraordinary Providence, *equally* ad-
ministred, the guilty Persons ought to suf-
fer by *Divine Vengeance*, and the corrupt
and remiss Magistrate too, as being guilty of
a Crime in not doing his Duty. In the pre-
sent Case, God being *God* as well as *King*,
and being just, and true to his Promise, and
measuring every one’s Actions by the rule of
right, if he is obliged in virtue of the *theo-*
cracy to see that *no Transgressor escapes Pu-*
nishment, it is certain, that He has Power
to make them all suffer; and he has Know-
ledge, which no Magistrate, more than the
disobedient Child, could escape. He there-
fore

fore with ease could know whatever happened in the State; and by displacing one Viceroy, and putting in another, or by a previous Knowledge of who would be remiss or corrupt, he could remedy this Evil.

But, says Mr. Warburton, “ We are not “ to suppose that Providence in this Case ge-“ nerally interfered, till the corrupt *Admi-*“ *nistration itself*, when ripe for Vengeance,“ had been *punished.*” *ibid.* The Interpo-
sition of an *equal* Providence must be very common, and very quick, because otherwise some *Transgressors* would escape *Punishment*, and some good Men would not reap the pre-
sent temporal Fruits of their Goodness. For which Reason we *cannot but suppose* that Providence would interfere constantly and soon. In the Case of a corrupt or remiss Magistrate, numberless Crimes might be committed, and the Offenders might escape, and prosper in this World, and die in their Prosperity. And if the wicked Magistrate continued very long, as *Manasseh* reigned fifty and five Years in *Jerusalem*, and a dis-
obedient Child escaped during a great part, or the whole of such a Reign, --- would not this long escape be the same to all in-
tents

tents and purposes, as if the wicked Child had lived under an *unequal* Providence? So that this excuse of *Inequality* is really such as proves not an *equal* Providence over *Particulars*, such as Mr. Warburton contends for, but an *unequal* one, founded on *Necessity* and “*the Reason of the thing:*”

2. He says, “in this *extraordinary* Ad-
“ ministration one part of the wicked was
“ sometimes suffered as a *Scourge* to the
“ other.” *ibid.* Allowing this; were these
Scourges themselves certainly punished after-
wards? Or did not these *Scourges* of the
Wicked scourge the *Righteous* too? The
Psalmist speaks of the *mighty* that were *ga-*
thered against him, and begs to be delivered
from the *Workers of Iniquity*, and from *bloody*
Men. Were these Men only *Scourges* of
the *Wicked*, or did they not lie in wait for
the Soul of a good Man, not for his *Trans-*
gression, or for his *Sin?* Ps. lix. 2, 3.

Perhaps we may be told, that *these Workers of Iniquity* were *Pagan Neighbours* and not *Jews*. Can it be said, that those whom *David* mentions as ready to *swallow him up*, Ps. lvii. 2. were *Heathens*? Was it an *Heathen* that *David* complains of, whose

Violence

Violence and Strife be had seen in the City.
Pſ. iv. Was it not a wicked Man, who was his *Acquaintance*, and *with whom He walked into the House of God?* These wicked Scourges therefore of the *Wicked* plagued the *Righteous* too; and yet in this extraordinary Administration they seem not to be more remarkably punished than they are now, when all allow we are under an *Unequal Providence*:

3. Mr. Warburton tells us, "that the "extraordinary Providence to the *State* "might sometimes *clash* with that to *Particulars*; as in the *Plague for numbering the People*:" ibid.

Here again we have a Case put to prove an equal Providence so administered, as to occasion an Observation of Inequality, and strictly proving a *clashing* of one Part of it with the other. One would naturally think, that what cannot be administered without an Inconsistency in itself, cannot be administered by a wise Being at all. How can we admit in any possible Case, that the extraordinary Providence to the *State* should be inconsistent with that to *Particulars*, in the Hands

of so wise and good, and powerful a Being as God is?

An Extraordinary Providence over the State was certainly promised by God when he took upon himself the Government of the Jews. Whether an Extraordinary Providence over *Particulars* was then engaged, so as that no Transgressor should escape Punishment, no Observer of the Law should miss present Temporal Blessings, is the Point to be proved. When Mr. Warburton instances in a Point wherein the extraordinary Providence to the One might *clash* with That to the Other, He names a Case where Both, in his Opinion, cannot possibly be administered. When therefore the Plague was sent for numbering the People, many *innocent* People suffered for David's Fault, which shews, that in that Instance an *Unequal* Providence was administered; and consequently, that the Scriptures do in Fact represent that Nation, not under the Notion of an Equal Providence, but of an Unequal one.

Lastly, Mr. Warburton has Recourse to a *Suspension* of the Extraordinary Providence at particular Times, or on certain Occasions, and

and by that Means accounts for some real *Inequalities*. " Sometimes, says he, the " extraordinary Providence was suspended " for a Season to bring on a national Re- " pentance ; but at the same time this Sus- " pension was publicly denounced: And a " very severe Punishment it was, as leav- " ing Men who had no future State of Re- " wards and Punishments in a very disconfo- " late Condition: And this was what oc- " caisioned the Complaints of the impatient " Jews, who had been so much accustomed " to an extraordinary Administration." p.
444-5.

By " leaving Men who had no future State of Rewards and Punishments," I suppose is meant Men, who had no *Nation*, *Belief*, or *Hope* of a future State of Rewards and Punishments. This *Suspension*, he says, was " publicly denounced." But not One Proof is produced of such a public Denuntiation of a *Suspension* of the *extraordinary Providence* to *Particulars*. The only Passages refer'd to for this *public Denuntiation* of a *Suspension* of this equal Providence are, *Isaiah* iii. 5. lix. 2. lxiv. 7. In the first of these, God threatens to take away from

Jerusalem the Stay of Bread and Water, the mighty Man, the Judge, the Prophets, the Prudent and the Antient ; and to give Children to be their Princes, and Babes shall rule over them. Then immediately follows the Verse refer'd to.--- *And the People shall be oppressed, every one by another, and every one by his Neighbour : The Child shall behave himself proudly against the Antient, and the Base against the Honourable.* Here is certainly a great Evil threatned to Jerusalem and Judah ; but as for a *Suspension* of an Extraordinary Providence, here is not one Word. If any Thing is to be gather'd from Hence, it is a total Deprivation of all Care and Concern for an abandoned, desolated People.

And so it is in the second Place refer'd to, Isa. lix. 2. *Your Iniquities have separated between you and your God, and your Sins have hid his Face from you, that he will not hear.* How does this relate to an Equal, more than to an Unequal Providence over Particulars ? It is as true now, as it was then, that Iniquities will separate between us and God ; and it has no Relation to any *Suspension* of an Extraordinary Providence for a particular Time. As little to the Purpose

is the third Passage. c. lxiv. 7. *For thou hast hid thy Face from us, and hast consumed us, because of our Iniquities.* Is this a public Denuntiation of a *Suspension* of a Providence for a Time, or is it not a Declaration of something past? Does this relate to a Providence equally administred to *Particulars*, or to the People in general?

But let us admit, that a *Suspension* of the extraordinary Providence was publicly denounced in these Passages of the Prophet:—
“ *It was a very severe Punishment.*” To whom? Why, to such as it “ left in a very *disconsolate Condition.*” Who were they? Why ALL the Jews; for all the Jews, it seems, *had no future State of Rewards and Punishments*: All of that Nation, the Virtuous and Wicked, the Good and the Bad: For none of them believed, or had any Hopes of a future State of Rewards and Punishments, as is all along pretended. All of them then being left in a *very disconsolate Condition*, “ this occasioned the *Complaints* “ of the *Impatient Jews*, who had been so “ much accustomed to an *extraordinary Administration.*” Here again I must ask, Who were these *Complainants*? Should he

say; *All* who had no future State of Rewards and Punishments, --- this again is saying, that *All* the Jews Good and Bad complained. There are indeed Instances of *Good* Mens complaining of Wicked Men, who treated the *Word of God* with Contempt, and laughed at the *Threats* uttered by the Prophets. But there is not an Instance of any *Evil* Mens Complaints, that an Extraordinary Providence was either *suspended*, or not administred.

The Jews had been much accustomed to an extraordinary Dispensation, and now this Extraordinary Providence is *suspended*, and publicly known to be so. This was “a severe Punishment,” certainly to all Good Men, because God was wont, and had engaged himself to grant particular Blessings to all such; whereas by this *Suspension*, they were no longer entitled to any of them. But here, methinks, it appears strange, that *Good* Men shall be deprived of their Privileges, because there happens to be a Majority of Evil ones. The Wisdom of an Administration consists in preventing Wickedness from spreading, or in correcting, and not suffering it to get to too great a Head.

Head. Why then should the Good suffer, on account of the *Bad*? Why should the Good be punished in an Equal Providence? For as to the *Wicked*, the Suspension of the Extraordinary Providence was so far from being a *severe Punishment*, or any *Punishment* at all, that it was the greatest Happiness that could befall them. They might now go on in their Wickedness secure and safe: They had no Hopes or Fears of a future State of Rewards or Punishments: They prospered in this World, and therefore were in no *disconsolate Condition*. The Good might complain; but then they would not change their Practices: The Wicked would not complain, nor change; and consequently this very *severe Punishment* was inflicted and felt by only such as did not deserve it; whilst those, who should have been reformed, were more encouraged in their Wickedness from the *Suspension* of that, which only could have kept them in Order. For no future State of Rewards or Punishments being supposed to be known or believed by this People, a present Impunity was an actual Encouragement to them to go on in the Enjoyment of their Sins.

In all the Instances, which Mr. Warburton has produced, from *Isaiah*, *Jeremiab*, *Amos*, *Zephaniab* and *Malachi*, he takes it for granted, that either there is a *Suspension* of the *Extraordinary Providence*, publicly denounced, or actually made. But has he shewn, that a *Suspension* was actually made at any, or all those Times? One cannot but observe, that the Wicked are very bold at those Times; and they treated the Word of the Lord with Disdain and Contempt, and if the Prophets mentioned a *woful Day*, or a Day of Accounts, they cried out, *Let it come.* The Prophets denounced their Woes; and the Wicked despised their Threats; But how it appears from these, or such like Expressions, that the *extraordinary Providence* was *suspended*, I know not. The great Point was first to have been *proved*, that ever there was such an Extraordinary Providence to *Particulars*, as that no Transgressor ever escaped Punishment, nor did any Observer of the Law miss his present Reward. This, I say, should *first* have been *proved*; which I apprehend has not been done; Nor in Course will any of these Passages from the Prophets prove

prove a *Suspension* of that equal Providence over *Particulars*, which seems never to have been exerted.

It is certainly a great Difficulty, that Mr. *Warburton* had to surmount, when he attempted upon his Scheme to account for the Representations of Inequality, which the Scriptures so plainly make. He does not therefore rest on the Solutions, which I have mentioned : He saw, I suppose, the Weakness of them. He proceeds therefore in the *last* Place to give a *full* and general Solution of the Difficulty. It stands thus,

" But the full and general Solution of
" the Difficulty is this, --- The common
" Cause of these Complaints arose from the
" Gradual *withdrawning*: the extraordinary
" Providence. Under the *Judges* it was
" perfectly *Equal*. When the People had
" rebelliously demanded a King, and ---
" God suffer'd the Theocracy to be admi-
" nistered by a *Viceroy*, there was --- a great
" Abatement in the Vigour of this extra-
" ordinary Providence. --- From *hence* to the
" Time of the *Captivity*, the extraordinary
" Providence kept gradually decaying, till on
" their

218 . . . The NATURE of the
“ their full Settlement, after their Return,
“ it entirely ceased.” p. 445. Just in like

I have had Occasion to cite these Words before, and I shew'd you some Consequences from them. Dr. Spencer, and Mr. Warburton seem to express themselves so exactly alike, about the *Institution* of the Theocracy, that one would wonder how it should happen, that Dr. Spencer's Notion is “ a *Conceit highly absurd,*” and Mr. Warburton's should be so consistent, and easy, and natural. But what I would observe here is, That what here is called “ a full Solution of the Difficulty,” leaves us as much in the dark as any of the Solutions before given. For, *and indeed I wish to shew*,

i. The extraordinary Providence, which was over Particulars, (by which is always meant such a Providence, that “ no Transgressor escaped Punishment, nor Observer of the Law missed his Reward”) kept gradually decaying; or gradually withdrawing to the Time of the Captivity. After Samuel's Time, there was a great *Abatement* of its Vigour; and from his Time, for about five hundred Years together it gradually decayed. What now was this Vigour,

or

or what did it consist in? For this ought particularly to be known, in order to judge of its *Abatement*. If it consisted in the constant, temporal Evils, which attended every Transgressor of the Law, till *Saul's Time*, and the constant Blessings that attended every Observer of the Law till the same Time; then as the *Vigour* consisted in this, its *Abatement* must be, in not inflicting *constantly* temporal Evils on the One, or in not giving constantly temporal Blessings to the Other: Or else, in not dispensing constantly so *great* Evil or Good, as was wont in the Time of the *Judges* to be given. It cannot be the *Former* of these Two Notions, because, if the *equal Providence* was *not* constant, it would come to be the same as *Unequal*. For what is the *Common Providence*, or *not extraordinary*, but where Transgressors are often not punished here, but go on and prosper in their Wickedness; and Good Men are often not rewarded, but sometimes suffer?

If Mr. *Warburton* means the *latter* of these Notions, that Good and Evil was not dispensed in so *great a Degree* to *Particulars*, after *Samuel's Days*, as before them; and

and that the Dispensation of Good and Evil to Particulars gradually decayed for five hundred Years together, till the Time of the Captivity.---This will require a particular Proof, which hitherto has not been so much as attempted. What Degrees of this Dispensation were left at the very Time of the Captivity? When the Return from the Captivity came to pass, and the Extraordinary Providence revived, Was it such an Equal Providence, as was in the Days of the Judges, when "no Transgressor escaped Punishment, or Observer of the Law missed his Reward," Or was it only such a Providence as was in any given Time between the Days of Saul and Zedekiah?

But does not Mr. Warburton produce some Evidence, that an Extraordinary Providence revived after the Return? Yes, he does. He cites, *Haggai*, i. 6-11. c. ii. 16-19. *Zech.* viii. 12. *Malac.* iii. 10, 11. p. 417. But none of these Places prove any Thing more, than a promised Blessing to the Jews, nationally considered; not such a Providence over Particulars, as no Transgressor of the Law was to escape Punishment. The Words of *Malachi* are, --- *Bring ye all the Tithes*

Tithes into the Storehouse, that there may be Meat in my House, and prove me now bere- with, saith the Lord of Hosts, if I will not open you the Windows of Heaven, and pour you out a Blessing, that there shall not be room enough to receive it. And I will rebuke the Devourer for your Sakes, and he shall not destroy the Fruits of your Ground; neither shall your Vine cast her Fruit before the Time in the Field, saith the Lord of Hosts. Here is certainly a great Blessing promised; but that it was not an Equal Providence to Particulars, but a National, general Promise, appears from the very next Words. --- *All Nations shall call you blessed, for ye shall be a delightsome Land.* And so in the Other Texts, a Promise is made by God to the Jews, that the Ground shall give her Encrease, and the Heavens shall give their Dew, and he will bless them in their Seed, and Vine, and Fig Tree, and Olive Tree; but this does not prove that Equal Providence, for which it is brought. It proves a very strong Promise to bless the Nation of the Jews; and to protect them against the Devourer, that he should not destroy the Fruits of their Ground. But as to a Proof of

an Extraordinary Providence, in the Sense that no Transgressor was to escape Punishment, nor no Observer of the Law miss his Reward, I cannot see the Force of his Argument.

Thus have I considered, what this great Author has told us concerning the Jewish Theocracy. How far his Notions agree to *Fact*, or plain *History*, I must leave you to judge. To me, what has been hitherto published, is all Confusion, and full of inextricable Difficulties. But as he has promised us to clear up this Matter in his Third Volume; I shall wait with Impatience till that is published, when I hope to see all these, and such like Objections removed, and the whole set in an intelligible Light.

I now proceed to another Subject, on which Mr. Warburton has given us his Sentiments very freely, I mean Sir Isaac Newton's Chronology. If on this Head I am somewhat longer, than I have been on any of the former, it is because here are more Materials, in which I differ from him. Matters of Chronology, in those early Times,

Times, are certainly very intricate? And Sir *Isaac* has shewn so very great Sagacity in adjusting and reconciling the fabulous Stories of the Antients, and in making them accord, that if he has not hit upon the *Truth*, he has made the whole so very *probable*, so consistent with the course of Nature, and with itself, and above all with sacred History, that it is not easy to shake so compact and well united a Building. At least I think Mr. *Warburton* has not done it, even supposing Sir *Isaac* to have been mistaken in his Chronology of *Egypt*.

Mr. *Warburton* begins with some very high strain'd Compliments to so great a Genius; "a Man, says he, whom *Science* and " *Virtue* seemed to be at Strife about, which " should render him most illustrious, while " they *equally* concurred to make him the " Ornament of human Kind." p. 206. But alafs, "the most sublime Understanding has " its Bounds, and what is much more to be " lamented, the strongest Mind has its Foible. This *Miracle of Science*, who so opened the present course of Nature to " human View, as if he had been immediately enlightened by the Almighty Author

" thor of it, when he came to *correct old Time in the Chronology of Egypt.*" ---

Hold, Sir. Did this great Genius ever attempt "to *correct old Time*" in the Chronology of *Egypt*, or in the Chronology of any other Place? No. No more than he attempted to *correct* the Laws of Gravitation. His Design was "to make Chronology suit "with the course of Nature; with Astro- "nomy, with sacred History, with *Herodotus* the Father of History; and with its "self," as he tells us himself in his *Introduction*, p. 8. But he never attempted, that I ever heard of till now, to "*correct old Time*" in the Chronology of *Egypt*, or in any of his Motions. Are *Chronologers*, disagreeing, jangling, disputing for ever, the same as *old Time*? Or are not their Disputes about *old Time*, such as ought if possible to be corrected?

Well. But let Mr. Warburton proceed ---
 " When he came to correct old Time in
 " the Chronology of *Egypt*, he suffered
 " himself to be drawn away from the *Garden of Moses* into the thickest of the
 " *Egyptian Darkness*, by *little lying Greek Mythologists*, and *Story Tellers.*"

Here

How are the mighty fallen! Does not Sir Isaac make use of every Author that Mr. Warburton himself does? Does he prefer any *Mythologist* to a Good *Historian*? Does he not use every Help he can get? With what Conscience then, with what Justice is he charged with “suffering himself to be drawn away” from Truth and Light “by “little lying Greek Mythologists and Story “Tellers?”

But so it was; He was drawn away by them. “For it is to be observed, that Sir Isaac’s *Egyptian Chronology* was fashioned ONLY to support his *Grecian*; which he erected on one of those sublime Conceptions peculiar to his amazing Genius.”
p. 207.

Behold Sir, and admire the Consistency of FLATTERY! When “Science and Virtue were at Strife about which should render” this great Man “most illustrious,” *Virtue* contributed but little to his Glory: FOR it seems, “He fashioned his *Egyptian Chronology*,” not to search out *Truth*, not to reconcile it with the Course of Nature, or the Bible, or any good History; but “ONLY to support his *Grecian Chronology*.”

Q.

And

And truly *Science* had as little Success in forming this Great Man as *Virtue* had; for instead of conducting him, as she ought, she suffer'd him to be "drawn away by little lying "Greek Story Tellers." At the same time (for there is no End of Self-Contradiction) *Science* did its Part; for tho' he was drawn away by these "little lying *Greek* Mythology gifts," he "erected his *Grecian* Chronology on one of those sublime Conceptions "peculiar to his amazing Genius."

One would think by this, that his *Greek* Chronology was all true and right; and acknowledged such by Mr. Warburton, however false his *Egyptian* Chronology may be. "The sublime Conceptions peculiar to this "amazing Genius" were such, were so noble, were so superlatively grand, "as if he "had been immediately enlightned" by the Author of Nature. Who would not conclude, that a Chronology founded on these "sublime Conceptions", was most perfect, exact, true? And yet, by a strange Reverse of Things, a Chronology, both *Egyptian* and *Greek*, "erected on these sublime Conceptions peculiar to this amazing Genius" is all false. Never surely was Compliment

so awkwardly paid. Amazing Genius ! Form'd by *Science* and *Virtue* ! Enlightned by the Author of Nature ! The Ornament of Human Kind ! Master of the most sublime Conceptions ! What is not to be expected from such Compliments ? This Great Man, What has he done ? Why, he has formed a Scheme, or erected one, on one of those "sublime Conceptions peculiar to " him," that "contradicts sacred Scripture, " and the very Nature of Things ;" in which "the Premisses," which he uses, "do not infer" what they are brought for. His System is "not only repugnant " to the Bible, but to *itself*." It contains "such a strange Mixture of Barbarity and " Politeness, Strength and Impotence, " Riches and Poverty ; is such an Inconsistency in the Character of Ages, as " makes it only worthy the wild Imagination of those poetic *Fabulists*, from " whence it is collected." p. 280. "So pestilent a Mischief in the Road to Truth " is a favourite Hypothesis ! An Evil, which "retarding our Progress at almost every " Step, we have had too frequent Occasion

"to lament in the Course of this Enquiry."

p. 207.

It is true, that when a favourite *Hypothesis* has been indulged, Truth is seldom pursued as it ought; nay usually it diverts Men from the *Road to Truth*, and will make them use not only Premisses, which do not infer what they are designed to support; but even false Premisses, which being supposed to be true, will not, even then, infer the Conclusion they are design'd for. I apprehend this to be much more the Case of Mr. Warburton, than of Sir Isaac Newton. However, when all the high strain'd Compliments upon that *amazing Genius* end in such grievous Accusations,---in his contradicting the *History*, nay, and the ASTRONOMY of the Bible; in his contradicting himself, and the Nature of Things, Mr. Warburton might surely have been contented to let it "*blaze and pass away.*" But he was willing to express his Fears of some bad Use that might be made some Time or other of Sir Isaac's System, and at the same time, I suppose, to pass a great Compliment upon the *Bible*: And let it be repeated here, "*The Bible is ETERNAL like*

the

" the Sun, the never-failing Fountain of
 " Light and Life." p. 208. Sounding
 Words, but no Meaning. If he means
Eternal, a parte ante, the oldest Part of
 that Book was wrote a little above *three thousand* Years ago; and this is as much
ETERNAL as the Sun, which was created
 between five and six thousand Years ago: or if he means *eternal, a parte post*, does he
 think the Sun will endure strictly *for ever*? So that this Strain of Compliment amounts
 to no more than this, That a Thing which
 is *not eternal*, is *eternal*, like another Thing,
 which is in no Sense *eternal*. Who can help
 admiring such excessive, such neat Compli-
 ments? But enough of this.

Before Mr. *Warburton* attempts to con-
 fute Sir *Isaac Newton's* System, he premises
 Two Observations " concerning the Nature
 " of this System, and the Quality of his
 " Evidence." p. 211.

The First is, " That this System is so
 " far from being a Support, Defence, or
 " Illustration of the antient History of
 " these Two Heroes [*Osiris* and *Sesostris*]
 " that it contradicts and subverts all that is
 " clear and certain in that History, and

" adds new Confusion to all that is obscure." *ibid.* In a Charge of this Nature against a Man, whom Virtue and *Science* were at Strife to form, One ought to expect very clear Evidence. Accordingly Mr, *Warburton* tells us, --- "The Annals of *Egypt*, as may be seen by *Herodotus*, *Diodorus Siculus*, *Strabo*, *Plutarch*, and others, who all copied from them, were as express and unvariable for the real Diversity of *Osiris* and *Sesostris*, as the History of England is for that of any Two of our own Country Monarchs. For they were not vague Names of uncertain or adjoining Times; but one the most illustrious of their *Demigods*; and the other, of their *Kings*, each fixed in precise Periods; and those vastly different from one another." *ibid.*

We have here an Observation delivered with as much Positiveness and Precision, as if it were a Maxim indisputable.

First, Here is a direct Assertion, that *Herodotus*, and the rest of the great Names here mentioned, ALL COPIED the Annals of *Egypt*. Now, what Authority has Mr, *Warburton* to prove, that *Herodotus* ever copied

copied any *Annals of Egypt*, before the Days of *Psammitichus*? *Herodotus* himself never pretends to such Authority; no, nor does he pretend to know the Truth from such *Annals*; but only tells us, that what he says, *the Priests told him.* (a) He therefore very rightly and judiciously, and becoming the Character of a faithful Historian, distinguishes betwixt the Days *before* and after *Psammitichus's Time*. What he relates of their old Affairs depends upon the Credit of the *Egyptian Priests*, those “*Masters in the Trade*” of Lying and Invention, who told him what they thought fit. And therefore he says of those Times, *καθά ήντον*, *as I have heard.* When he comes to give an Account of *Psammitichus*, he tells us, how the *Carians* and *Ionians* came into *Egypt*, and how they were placed below the City *Bubastis*, l. ii. c. 154. A proper Place to give the *Greeks*, because they could the better secure *Egypt* from any Incursions from the East. These *Carians* and *Ionians* were the first of a strange Language that dwelt in *Egypt*; and they had *Egyptian*

(a). V. *Herod.* l. 2. c. 3. 5. 10. 12. 29. 55. 79. 99.
100. 102. 116. 120. 122. 123. 127. &c.

232 Sir Isaac Newton's
Children deliver'd to them to be instructed
in the Greek Tongue; from whom sprung
those, who in Herodotus's Time were the
Interpreters. Now says he, from these,
who dwell in Egypt, and have Commerce
with the Greeks we know of certainty,
ἀτρεκέως, the Affairs of Egypt from Psam-
mitichus's Time, and afterwards. That is,
from the Æra of Nabonassar 64, when
Psammithicus began to reign, or of the same
Æra 118, when he died. How does this
Account of Herodotus himself agree with
Mr. Warburton, who tells us, he copied the
Annals of Egypt?

2. Manetho, who wrote (b) from the Sacred Books, (c) refutes Herodotus in many Things, as relating falsely the Egyptian Affairs. So Josephus tells us. Did the Egyptian Annals then differ from one another? Or did Herodotus falsify them, since he told so many Falshoods about the Egyptian Affairs, in Mistake, or Contradiction to Manetho's Annals?

(b) Ἐκ τῶν ιερέων. Iosep. c. Ap. 1. 1.

(c) Πολλὰ τὸν Ἡερόλον ἐλέγχει τῷ γ Αιγυπτίων
ἐπεισμένον. Jof. c. Ap. 1. 1.

3. *Diodorus Siculus* is the next, who we are told copied these Annals of *Egypt*. Now He owns, that *Osiris* was *Serapis* according to some; *Bacchus*, *Pluto*, *Ammon*, *Jupiter*, according to others; but most think him to be *Pan*. l. i. 15. Does He agree with *Herodotus* in the Number, or the Names of the Old *Egyptian* Kings? No. Does He agree in their Actions, or the Places they built? No. Does He mention *Nitocris*, whom *Herodotus* has? Or has *Herodotus* *Diodorus's Busiris* and *Uchoreus*? Do they agree even in the later Times? How then is it that Mr. *Warburton* tells us, that He and *Herodotus* copied from the *Annals of Egypt*?

4. When he tells us with so much Precision, what these *Annals of Egypt* say, and adds, that they [*Osiris* and *Sesostris*] are not Names of *uncertain Times*;--- Can he say from those *Annals*, when either of these Men, so distinct as he pretends they were, lived? Where are these *Annals of Egypt* that fix the "precise Periods," when either *Osiris* or *Sesostris* lived? Were these Annals themselves extant in *Herodotus's Days*? Or were

were not their *ancient Records* destroy'd before his Time?

But it is not yet Time to enter into this Matter, till we have seen from Mr. Warburton, himself, what Credit is due to these Annals. He therefore thus goes on in his Observation:

"The History of *Egypt* was, not, like that of antient *Greece* and *Suevia*, to be found only in the traditional Tales of *Bards* and *Mythologists*; nor yet, like that of early *Britain*, the Invention of sedentary *Monks*, but consisted of the annual and authentic Records of an active and learned Priesthood." p. 212.

May we not now expect to meet with something fixt and certain, and much to be depended on from these *annual* and *authentic* Records; these faithful Accounts wrote by "an active and learned Priesthood?" They were not "the Invention of Sedentary Monks;" no, nor "traditional Tales of Bards and Mythologists;" nor corrupt Stories of we know not Who, but *authentic* Accounts wrote by learned Priests. If Sir Isaac therefore has contradicted, or varied from These, it is easy, without Doubt, to confute him from such Establish'd Authority;

rity. But how soon are these *annual* and *authentic Records* turned by Mr. Warburton himself into the mere *Invention* of *Sedentary Priests*, a Set of Men, as bad to the full, *quoad hoc*, as *Sedentary Monks*. The very next Words, after he has told us, that these *authentic Records* came from an active and learned *Priesthood*, are these, --- "In which
" the only Transgression against Truth that
" has yet been discovered, is, that natural
" Partiality common to all national Histo-
" riographers, of extending back their *Annals*
" to an *unreasonable Length of Time*." So
then the History of *Egypt* was not *Inven-
tion*; it was only *extended back* by an active
and learned *Priesthood* to an *unreasonable
Length of Time*. These Priests could make
authentic Records, which *sedentary Monks*
could not do without the Imputation of
Invention.

Be it so then, that these active Priests *extended back* their *Annals* to an *unreasonable Length of Time*, the Business of a Good Chronologer should be, one would think, to correct these Corruptions or Mistakes, to bring down to their right Periods those Accounts that were *unreasonably extended backward*:

backward: And if Osiris was fixed in any Period of their *Demigods*, how precisely and exactly soever those Forgers of Records had placed him, yet, if he was demonstrably placed wrong, and no Circumstances will agree to such a Period, it cannot but be right to bring him down to a Time, when Circumstances will agree to him.

"The ONLY Transgression against Truth in the History of Old *Egypt* was, the EXTENDING BACK their Annals to an unreasonable Length of Time." This is asserted p. 212. If we go on to p. 245-6. These *Egyptian Priests*, that could not be charged with any *Invention*, except the One just mentioned, are charged with "INVENTING a Set of *Fables*, and by a strong Effort of their Skill, throwing a general Confusion over the HISTORY of the Actions of their Heroes, by bringing their Births even lower down than the Times of their certainly recorded Worship." So that these Masters in their Trade, these active and learned Priests, not only extended back their Annals, but corrupted and brought lower down the Actions of their Heroes. What now becomes of the *Authenticity*

Authenticity of Annals owned to be corrupted,
both backwards and forwards?

Mr. Warburton is endeavouring to shew,
“ from what Sources those Accounts arose,
“ on which the *low Date* of the Egyptian
“ Gods is founded.” “ The first Source,
“ says he, was the *Address* of the Egyptian
“ Priests to screen their Hero Worship
“ from the *Inquisition of the Curious*. We
“ have observed above from a famous *Fable*,
“ which the *Egyptian Priests INVENTED* to
“ record the Danger this Superstition in-
“ curr'd, and their Art in *evading* it, that
“ the Original of their *Hero-Gods* was, a
“ Subject MALITIOUSLY PURSUED by the
“ FREE INQUIRERS of those Times. For
“ the Discredit of this Superstition was, that
“ these Gods had been Men; and the Proof
“ of their Humanity was fetched from their
“ late Existence. Now what did THESE
“ MASTERS IN THEIR TRADE do to evade
“ this Proof? We have seen before what
“ they did to *obscure* the *Inquiry*. Why,
“ by an *equal Effort* of their Skill, they
“ INVENTED a Set of Fables, --- which
“ brought their Births even *lower down* than
“ the Times of their *certainly recorded*
• “ Worship.

"Worship. What they gained by this
"was considerable; it *threw a general Con-*
"fusion over the History of their Actions."

p. 245-6.

These Passages are so curious, that they will afford some considerable Remarks. As

i. It is granted, that the *Priests*, the active and learned Priests, *extended back* their Annals to an "unreasonable Length of Time:" And, then they brought the Births of their Hero Gods "*lower down* than the Times of their certainly recorded Worship." Had they kept within tolerable Bounds either Way, some Regard might be paid to the Learning of these *Masters in their Trade*. But their Extravagancy was such, as to extend their Annals back *thirty-two*, or *thirty-three thousand Years* before the Creation. Now, how Annals *extended back* thus much, and likewise *forwards*, can be of any Value towards settling the Time when any Man lived, I do not apprehend. And which can best be relied on for settling any Point of Chronology, the *little lying Greek Mythologists and Story Tellers*, or the *great lying Egyptian*

tian

tian Priests, who had so much *address*, and were so much *Masters in their Trade*?

2. A History of *Thirty Thousand Years*, (nay some mightily enlarge the Number to several Hundred Thousand, but to take the smallest number, *Thirty Thousand*) such a History of Kings, most of whom are expressly said to have done nothing worthy of notice, and not “the *Invention* of Sedentary “*Priests*,” must be very curious; especially as it is to be neither contrary to Scripture, nor the Reason of Things: And such were the Old *Egyptian Annals*, those *authentic Records* of an *active Priesthood*.

3. *Manetho* was an *Egyptian Chief Priest*; who wrote the History of his own Country, and was admitted to their *Secret Books*. Let us suppose these to be the Annals which *Herodotus* copied. Now did *Herodotus* copy *authentic Annals*, and did *Manetho* do the same, and yet condemn *Herodotus* of *Falshood*? It was well known that *Manetho* wrote at the command of (*d*) *Ptolemy Philadelphus*, and

(d) Βασιλεῖ μεγάλῳ Πτολεμαίῳ φιλαδέλφῳ — Ἡμές δὲ λογίζεσθαι περὶ πάντων ἀντὶ ἐαν βέλη ἡμᾶς ἔξελας τῷ πρεγμάτων ἐπέζητοι σοὶ περὶ τῶν μελλόντων τῷ κόσμῳ γίγνεσθαι, καθὼς ιερέυσας μοὶ πειρανήσείται σοὶ ἀκμάσσεια βιβλία γραφέντα ναὸς τῆς προπάτορος τρισμεγίσσῃ Ερμ. Syncell. p. 40.

that

that he had the HOLY Books wrote as is said by the great Mercury before him. These he interpreted, and afterwards he wrote of their Gods, Demigods, Heroes, and mortal Kings, of which the Egyptians (e) have compiled a long and trifling Mythology. The Egyptians then were Mythologists and Story Tellers, as well as the little Lying Greeks; and therefore to be as little depended on as the Greeks for History of Facts done by their Gods, Demigods, Heroes, &c. Now, what Credit is to be given to these very Books that *Manetho* copied? Mr. Warburton tells us, that "the Ignorance of the Greeks about Egyptian Affairs may fairly be collected from their Age, and from the Authors of their Intelligence. They all lived long after the times in question; and tho' they received indeed their Information from Egypt it self, yet for the most part, it was not till after the Destruction of that ancient Empire, and when it was now become a Province in Succession, to Asiatic and European Conquerors; when their ANTIENT AND PUBLIC RECORDS WERE DESTROYED, and their very learned

(e) Πολλὰν καὶ φλύαρον συνεῖρσι μυθολογίαν. ibid.

" ing

"ing and Genius changed to a conformity,
 "with their Grecian Masters." p. 28. And
 again, *Egypt* "was long the Mart of
 "Knowledge for the Eastern and the Wes-
 "tern World, and as nothing so much re-
 "commends this kind of Commodity as its
 "Antiquity, they set it off by FORGED RE-
 "CORDS, that extended to an unreasonable
 "Length of Time: Accounts of which have
 "been conveyed to us by Antient Authors,
 "and fully confuted by the Modern,"
 p. 29.

If this were the Case, I ask then, Whe-
 ther the *annual* and *authentic Records*. (those
 Labours of "the active and learned Priest-
 "hood") were in *Being* at the Times of
Herodotus or *Manetho*; much more in the
 Times of *Strabo* and *Plutarch?* *Cambyses*,
 when he conquer'd *Egypt*, carried away
 with him the Records of *Egypt*; and con-
 sequently *Herodotus* could copy none of them;
 but faithfully related what he could learn
 from the Priests. If *Herodotus* could not, such
 as came long after him could not: They
 could only write from what Mr. *Warburton*
 allows to be, and calls FORGED RECORDS.
 And that they did do so, appears from the

242 Sir Isaac Newton's
great Disagreement among all that are concerned in this Affair.

4. *Eusebius* saw Reason to attack these (*f*) *idle trifling Records of Egypt*, and complained much of them; and then comes *Pandorus*, a Monk of *Egypt*, and falls foul on *Eusebius* for not rightly apprehending his Authors.

5. There is an Old *Chronicon of Egypt*, which contained an History of Thirty-Six Thousand Five Hundred and Twenty-Five Years, which ended in *Nectanebus's Days*, *i. e.* some Time before *Alexander's Expedition*; and this differs from *Manetho's Numbers*. Without now mentioning *Eratosthenes*, or *Africanus*, or *Synecellus*,— From which of all these can we learn the authentic *Annals of Egypt*?

6. Since Mr. *Warburton* tells us, that “ the ONLY Transgression against Truth in these *Egyptian Priests* was their *extending back* their Annals to an unreasonable Length of Time;” I ask, ---Did they not invent *Fables* and *Lies* to support their *Idolatry*? Did they not invent *History*? Did

(f) Οὐεστίος μεμρόμενος τῆς φλυαδίας. *ibid.*

they

they not designedly throw Confusion upon all their History? It was the Effect of a *very active Priesthood*, tho' not of a *very honest one*, thus to *forge Records* to set off their own Antiquity; and He himself owns, that they transgressed against Truth in *many Respects*; tho' here, he says, they did it but in *One ONLY.*

7. I must not quit this famous Passage of Mr. Warburton, before I have made one more Remark upon it. Every one sees with what Zeal and Warmth he treats the present *Freetinkers*. Now it happens that He has an Occasion to speak of the *Egyptian Invention* to evade an Objection made to their Religion. The Objection was, "That their Gods had been *Men*, and the Proof of their Humanity was fetched from their late Existence." p. 245. "This Subject, says he, was *malitiously pursued* by the *Free Inquirers* of that Age." Why, I pray, does he call this a *malitious Pursuit*? Ought it not to have been pursued by every Lover of Truth? Why must that be imputed to *Malice*, which was so just, so reasonable, so unanswerable an Objection to those *knavish Inventors*, who were so re-

solutely determined at all Adventures to maintain their superstitious Follies?

Hero Gods, and their Worship implied a manifest Absurdity. The *Free Inquirers*, of those antient Times saw this very clearly, and objected the Folly of paying Adoration to Men of late Existence. The *Egyptian Priests* by "a strong Effort of their Skill," contrived to "throw a general Confusion over the History of their Actions," in order to blind Mankind, and to "make them as indisposed to believe the Old Stories of them, as these new *Fables*, which it was impossible they should credit." p. 246. I will not here ask, How he could say, that the ONLY Transgression against Truth in these *Egyptian Priests* was their *extending back* their Annals; But why is that here imputed by him to *Malice* in the *Free Inquirers* of those Times, since they had *Truth* on their Sides, and direct *Knavery* and *Forgery* was on the *Egyptian Priests* Side? I do not wonder, that all who would *freely enquire* now-a-days into Things, are treated by him as Fools, or Knaves, or Blockheads, ignorant in History, in Logic, in *Latin*, or *Greek*,

in good Manners, or in Politicks. Could an *Egyptian Priest* two or three thousand Years ago, have better acted his Part? Could he have used more *Address* to make his Adversary odious or contemptible? Somebody makes Objection to Hero Gods, and Hero Worship. Presently, He is a *Free Inquirer*: It is all *Malice*. As if the Fault lay in the *Free Inquirer*, and not in the *forging Priest*; as if it were a Crime to discredit so scandalous a Superstition, or to attack what those "*Masters in their Trade*" did, either to evade so strong a Proof, or to obscure the Enquiry.

Lastly, It may be worth observing here, that *Osiris* and *Iris* were placed in the Dynasty of the *Egyptian Gods*: And these had been *Mortals* deified. Now, if the Account here given of the Management of these Priests be true, These Gods should probably have been placed *higher* in Antiquity than *Manetho* has placed them; since these Priests placed their Gods *lower down* than the *Times of their CERTAINLY RECORDED Worship*. Now the Sixteenth Dynasty of Men began about the Days of *Abraham*. And the other fifteen prior to this lasted

above 3500 Years ; And before these were the *Demigods*, for 214 Years ; and before these was the *Dynasty of Gods*, in which *Osiris* is placed. If then this God is placed *lower down* than the Times of his *certainly recorded Worship* ; he is certainly still placed long *before the Creation* of the World ; and yet it seems he is *placed lower* by these Priests than he ought to be. What Regard now is to be paid to these *Annals*, thus abominably forged or corrupted, and which are extended so *unreasonably backwards* ? Or how does it appear, that these *Heroes* were placed *lower down* than the Times of their *certainly recorded Worship* ?

Thus much to his *first Observation*, made in order to weaken Sir Isaac's Account of the *Egyptian Chronology*. His *Second* is taken from the *Quality of the Evidence*, which is another “*legitimate Prejudice*” against this New Chronology. It is chiefly the “*fabulous History of Greece*, as delivered by “*their Poets and Mythologists.*” p. 212. How easy is it here to declaim upon “*that infinite Disorder, confounding all Succession of Time,--- its dismember'd and ill-join'd Parts of Time?*” I admit, that

the

the *fabulous History of Greece* is bad enough ; but surely the *Fabulous, Lying, Romantic History of Egypt*, is worse, or at least as bad. The *Greek Mythologists* have said very false Things : but then they have said something true : Whereas the “active learned Priesthood” of *Egypt* have *invented* a whole History of thirty thousand Years that is *all* false. The Fabulous Ages among the *Greeks* are miserably confused ; and those, who have wrote about those Times, have made very bad Work : But notwithstanding that, if from some Circumstances mentioned by the Poets and Mythologists, a Man of Judgment and Sagacity can pick out Materials agreeable to the Nature of Things, to Sacred History, to the Course of Nature, to the best Historians ; and can free what he says from Repugnances, ---- Surely it is absurd to argue, that such Evidence is not to be admitted. The Difficulty is to find out in the fabulous History, what is true, and to separate it from what is false : Now if some Circumstances, which the fabulous Writers mention, exactly agree with what true History relates, and all so tally together, as to confirm each other ; no

Reason can be given why a Man should not make use of them to serve the Purpose of Truth. Nor must any one argue, that whoever relates any Fable is not to be credited in what appears not to be Fable, unless you would destroy all History universally.

What now is the real Use made by Sir Isaac of these *Fabulous* Writers? Why, he has attempted from some Facts recorded by them, such as the Genealogies of many, the Numbers of Generations passed, and such like Circumstances, to settle, in some Cases, the Distances of Time from one to another; and every Body must own, that he has observed a great Co-incidence of Circumstances, which had escaped other Chronologers. He has tried, by a Method little minded by others, to determine the Years, or within the Compass of some few Years, when certain Facts were done; and this agreeable to the Course of Nature, and to the Helps which other Books could afford him.

It is granted, that “*Fable* naturally joins ‘together later and former Times.’ p. 213. But does Sir Isaac depend upon *fabulous* Writers alone? Has he no other Supports
for

for his Chronology? Yes. Mr. Warburton is forced to own, that the “*Historians of Greece and Egypt* are the other Part of “Sir Isaac’s Evidence.” *ibid.* What would he have more? Would he have had him make use of Mr. Warburton’s “active and “learned Priesthood,” the greatest *Liar*s that ever sat down to *invent History*? No. But “These Historians ought to be *beard* “out, but this he will not do.” I ask, Is he to take *every Thing* for granted, that these Historians say? Mr. Warburton himself owns in this very Page, that “antient “History *falsely improved*” certain Facts “through Mistakes.” Was he not then to take the Method he did; not to give into the *Inventions* of the *Sedentary Priests* of *Egypt*, those *Masters in their Trade of Lying*, but to follow what appears to agree to Nature, to Astronomy, to History, to the Bible, and to such Chronological Marks as might serve to direct and guide him through that wild, impracticable Forest of Antient History?

Mr. Warburton is pleased to observe, that “His Proofs are taken from Greek Mythologists, consisting of Scraps picked up “promiscuously

" promiscuously from Fabulists, Poets, Scholiaſts, &c." What an excellent Chronology would he frame, were he to take into his Aid none of the *Poets*, none of the *Scholiaſts*, none of all those Books, which his extensive, " &c." comprehends ? If he resolves against the Aid of all *Poets*, and all *Scholiaſts*, and all *Fabulists*, I know not whether he would not give us as false a Chronology, as his Sedentary Priests of *Egypt* did a History ; and, if the *Greeks* are all to be rejected as *Liars*, I am apt to think there will remain but little Foundation for true Chronology or History either. But why should he be so displeased with the *Poets*, and the old *Scholiaſts*? Are they of no Authority ? Or are they of Authority, when he uses them, and not when Sir *Isaac* does ? How often hath he cited them in his favourite Account of the Mysteries ? In one Page, I find *Callimachus*, and *Nonnus*, and *Lucan*, cited, p. 162. *Euripides* and *Aristophanes*, and *Sophocles*, and *Apollonius Rhodius*, and *Ovid*, and *Virgil*, &c. very often. And as to *Scholiaſts*, in one Page 206, he cites those upon *Euripides*, *Pindar*, *Sophocles*. How absurd is it for him to condemn

damn that great Man for using *Scraps pick'd up promiscuously from Fabulists, Poets, Schoolasts*, when he himself does the same Thing in Confirmation of his darling Discovery of the Mysteries?

This was Mr. Warburton's second Observation; and now I'll consider "the Inference he draws from them." It is this. "We have, in the Diversity of *Osiris* and *Sesostris*, a Circumstance of History delivered in the fullest, and most unvaria-ble Manner, by *Annalists of the best Authority*. All succeeding Ages agreed in the Fact; and *very strong, collateral Evidence* supports it." p. 213. Now,

1. These *Annalists of the best Authority*, are those *Egyptian Priests*, whom all the World knows to be the greatest *Liars*, and mere *Inventors* of History for many thousands of Years before the Creation. He himself has accused them of *forging Records*, and of designedly *throwing Confusion over all their History*. Are These the Men, whom he would have had Sir Isaac implicitly follow in their Chronology?

2. What is this "*very strong, collateral Evidence?*" What Authors? How near the

the Time of Osiris did they live? What Opportunities had they of knowing the Truth? What Grounds had they for their Assertions? Had the *Annalists* he refers to, any Knowledge of even *Letters* in those early Days near the Time that Osiris is pretended to have liv'd? Have you any Chronologer or Historian now extant, either *Egyptian* or *Greek*, from whom you can settle the *Annals of Egypt*? Or is there any that lived within a thousand, or many thousands of Years of Osiris Days, if we follow the absurd, wild Chronology of the *Egyptians*? The Priests told *Herodotus* some Stories, which he seems not to have believed, because he opposes what might fairly be depended upon after *Pshaminitibus's* Reign to what he had heard: So that He knew nothing of these *Annals*, or *Annalists of the best Authority*. And then, as to Mr. *Warburton's* " strong collateral Evidence," --- What is it, but that later Writers have told the Story upon as small Grounds as former ones have done? For as to *contemporary* Writers, of the same Age with Osiris, or very many Ages after him, there are none that mention him. This then

is what he means by saying "all succeeding
" Ages agree in the Fact," --- viz. Writers
not *Egyptian*, but what came after the times
of *Sesostris* (even supposing that he lived as
late as Sir *Isaac* makes him) a great deal above
500 Years, relate some things which they
had learnt from other Authors, or from In-
scriptions, or from Hearsay. Mr. *Warburton*,
at 2500 Years distance, considered as an *Eng-
lish* Writer, may be deemed a *collateral Evidence*,
as well as any *Greek* or *Roman* Wri-
ter whatever.

This being premised, let me next enquire
how he invalidates Sir *Isaac*'s Notion, that
Osiris and *Sesostris* were the same. Sir *Isaac*'s
Argument for their Identity of Person is this
--- " *Osiris*, *Bacchus*, and *Sesostris* lived about
" the same time, and by the Relation of
" Historians were all of them Kings of *all*
" *Egypt*, and reigned at *Thebes*, and adorned
" that City, and were very potent by Land
" and Sea: all *three* were great Conquerors,
" and carried on their Conquests by Land
" through *Asia* as far as *India*; all *three* came
" over the *Hellefpon*, and were there in
" Danger of losing their Army: All *three*
" conquered *Thrace*, and there put a Stop to
" their

" their Victories, and returned back from
" thence into *Egypt*: All *three* left Pillars
" with Inscriptions in their Conquests, and
" therefore all *three* must be *one* and the
" same King: And this King can be no
" other than *Sesac*. All *Egypt* including
" *Thebais*, *Aethiopia* and *Libya*, had no
" common King before the Expulsion of the
" Shepherds who reigned in the lower
" *Egypt*; no Conqueror of *Syria*, *India*,
" *Aisa Minor*, and *Thrace* before *Sesac*; and
" the sacred History admits of no *Egyptian*
" Conqueror of *Palestine*, before this King."

NEWTON's *Chronol.* p. 193. This is one Argument of Sir Isaac's, and to shew it of no Force, Mr. Warburton has compared the Actions of King *Arthur* and *William the Conqueror* in thirteen Particulars, from whence he argues --- " Here the Number of similar Circumstances in the Lives of *Arthur* and *William* are evidently more Characteristic of ONE than those in the History of *Osi-
ris* and *Sesostris*. Yet we know that *Ar-
thur* and *William* were really Two Men of Two very distant Ages." p. 216.

Did not Mr. Warburton see, or was he willing to conceal, the Force of the Argument which

which Sir Isaac urges? It does not lie in this only, that they did *similar Actions*, which would alone be to no more purpose than if he had said they had each two Hands, and each eat when they were hungry, as his two Heroes did likewise. But in this particular Fact, that there was but *One Egyptian King* that reigned over all *Egypt, Ethiopia and Libya*, till after the Expulsion of the Shepherds, and yet all these *Three* are said to have done so. Suppose now that *Arthur* and *William* had agreed in so many Instances as Mr. *Warburton* says, and then it had been added, that *Britain* was never conquered but by *One*: Would not it then have been true, that if these two conquered *Britain*, and yet *Britain* was never but *once* conquered. --- *Arthur* and *William* would have been only different Names of the same Person?

Now *Herodotus* tells us, that *Sesostris* was the (g) ONLY *AEgyptian* that reigned over *AEthiopia*. *Strabo* says, that *Sesostris* was the (h) FIRST that conquered *AEthiopia*: and in

(g) Μῆνος Ἀιγύπτιος ἀιθιοπίνος ἦρε. Herod. l. 2. c. 110.

(h) Φαίνεται τὴν Αἰθιοπίδα, καὶ τὴν Τεωγυλοδούτικὴν πρῶτος καταστρέψαμενος εἴτε. viz. *Sesostris*. Strabo p. 1114. l. 1. Edit. Amsl. alias. p. 769.

another

another Place he speaks of Him as (*i*) overrunning all Æthiopia as far as the Cinnamon-bearing Region. Now if Osiris conquered and reigned over Æthiopia, and Sesostris was the First and only One, or the only Ægyptian that conquered and reigned over Æthiopia, these Two must be One and the same Person.

That Osiris was an Ægyptian, and reigned over Ethiopia, Diodorus Siculus tells us : For He (*k*) appointed Busiris to take care of those Parts which lay towards Phœnicia, and the Sea [*i. e.* the lower Egypt]; and he appointed Antæus to take care of Ethiopia and Libya. He reigned therefore over all Egypt, and over Ethiopia and Libya. When he conquered Ethiopia, (*l*) he taught them Agriculture, and he built considerable Cities, and left proper Persons to take care of the Country, and to gather the Tributes. Thence he (*m*) marched through Arabia, by the Red Sea, to

(*i*) Σέσωσεις τὸν Ἀιθιοπίαν ἐπῆλθεν ἀπασαν μέχει τῆς κινναμωφόρου. Strab. p. 1138. alias 790.

(*k*) Επιμελήσας δὲ τοῖς τῶν μὲν περὶ φωιίην κεκλιμένων μέρων καὶ τῶν σπερ χαλαρήτη τόπων Βεσιρεν, τῶν δὲ καὶ τὴν Αιθιοπίαν καὶ λιβύην Αυγαῖον. Diod. l. i. p. 10. Ed. Steph.

(*l*) Κατὰ δὲ Ἀιθιοπίαν, διδάξαντα τὸς ἀνθράκες τὰ μετὰ τὸν γυναικίαν, καὶ πόλεις ἀξιολόγους ιδίσαντα καταλιπεῖν τὰς σπιμεληπομένους τῆς χώρας καὶ τὰς φόρους ἐισπεφεξέμενες. ibid. p. 11.

(*m*). Ἐπειδὴ ποιήσασθαι τὸν πορείαν δι' Ἀραβίας παρὰ τὴν Ερυθρὰν θάλασσαν, ὡς Ικδῶν καὶ τῷ πέργατος τῆς ὄπης μένεις. ibid. p. 12.

the Indies, and the furthermost Parts of the Earth. Now these Actions can agree only to *Sesostris*; and are all founded on the Authority of the best Historians; not pick'd up from *Poets*; or any *Mythologists*. If the Proof be wanted that *Sesostris* did these things, *Strabo* and *Herodotus* are Evidences just cited: and *Lucan*, though a Poet, may be added for his Western Conquests.

Venit ad occasum mundique extrema Sesostris. l. 10.

The Question now is, whether *Osiris* and *Sesostris* are different *Persons*, or are they only two *Names* of one and the same Person?

To prove them really distinct *Persons*, Mr. *Warburton* assures us, “ That it was an old Egyptian Custom to call their earlier Heroes after the Name of their earlier Gods.” p. 217. This may account for *Sesostris*’s being called *Osiris*, if ever that was their Custom; tho’ a much better, and much more natural Reason might be affigned. But here the Reader is sadly disappointed, since Mr. *Warburton* has not produced one single Instance of this. *Sesostris*; as far as I can find, was never called *Osiris*; as from an earlier Person: Nay, Mr. *Warburton* himself carries this Point no farther, than

to say, " That it is *highly reasonable* to suppose, that this Name was given him." p. 220.

The Argument, which Sir Isaac uses to prove, that *Osiris* and *Sesostris* were not *distinct Persons*, is, That they *Both* reign'd over ALL *Egypt*, *Aethiopia* and *Libya*: Now *Sesostris* was the *One only*, and the *First King* that did so. Therefore *Osiris* was only a different *Name*, not a *distinct Person* from *Sesostris*. To tell us, that it was an *Egyptian Custom* to *call later Heroes after the Name of their earlier Gods*, is nothing to the Purpose. For if *Osiris* and *Sesostris* were *distinct Persons*, then *Two* reign'd over all *Egypt*, and *Two* conquer'd *Ethiopia* and *Libya*; contrary to *Herodotus* and *Strabo's EXPRESS ASSERTIONS*.

Mr. Warburton had said, --- " *It is highly reasonable to suppose, that this Name was given him*," viz. That the Name of *Osiris* was given to *Sesostris*, " tho' they were really *distinct Persons*." There are but three Lines that come in between this *Supposition*, expressly so called; and He goes on to assert the *Fact*, --- " When now they HAD GIVEN them the same Name, not distinguished

" distinguished by the First and Second, Posterity frequently confounded them with one another, and in this Confusion gave the Actions of Osiris to Sesostris, and of Sesostris to Osiris." *ibid.* And again, " I have shewn, that a Sameness of Name was in Fact, the only Cause of that Conformity, and consequently that their Persons were distinct." p. 225. Has he proved, that Sesostris and Osiris were distinct Persons? No. It is but a *Supposition*; and then a *Fact* is asserted, grounded still upon a *Supposition*; by which we are not advanced one Step. It is roundly indeed asserted, that " Posterity frequently confounded" the two Men; whereas the Truth is, Posterity made Two Men out of One, *Two great Conquerors of Ethiopia, Asia, &c.* where there was but *One*; *Two Kings of all Egypt*, where there was but *One*; nor does the Sacred History of the Bible admit of any more than *One*.

It is said, That " if what Clemens *Alexandrinus* tells us be true, that Sesostris was sprung from Osiris, there was still a further Reason to give the later Hero the Name of his great Progenitor." *ibid.*

Who now would not imagine, that *Clemens* tells us, that *Sesostris* was sprung from *Osiris*? And yet *Clemens* only tells us, what one (*n*) *Athenodorus*, the Son of *Sandon*, had said, when he was endeavouring to give as great Antiquity as he could to *Sarapis*; and *Clemens* condemns him for his *Invention*. This *Athenodorus* had invented a Story, purely to serve his Purpose, that *Sesostris* order'd his Progenitor *Osiris* to be curiously made; and thus derives *Sarapis*, as if it were a Word compounded of *Osiris* and *Apis*, quasi *Osirapis*, *Sarapis*. A Story invented for the Sake of the Derivation. And how many imaginary Persons, mere Inventions are in all Languages made, purely for the same Reason? From such a Story no Conclusion can be drawn, either that *Osiris* was a real Person, or that he was a Progenitor of *Sesostris*.

The better then to make up his System, Mr. *Warburton* tells us, how this whole Affair was managed. “*Osiris*, because

(*n*) Αλλ' ὁ γε Ἀθηνόδωρος ὁ τῷ Σάνδωρος, ὀρχαῖς εν τὸν Σάραπιν βολιθεῖς, όν τοῦ ὅπως πεσέπεσεν ἐλέγχεις αὐτὸν ἀγαλμα τίναι γενήσον. Clem. Alex. coh. ad Gentes.

p. 43.

Σύνθετοι δὲ τε Ὁσίειδος καὶ Ἀπιος, γενύμενον Ὁσίερπις. ibid.

"Sesostris was so, is made a great Conqueror, at a Time when Egypt was but just emerging from a State of Barbarity into civil Policy. --- But this seems to be one of the *latest Corruptions* in their History; Herodotus giving none of these Conquests to Osiris, but to Sesostris only; whence I collect it was the Product of some Age between him and Diodorus Siculus, who gives it [them] to Osiris with all its [their] Circumstances, and supported by the Evidence of Antient Monuments."

p. 221. Does not Mr. Warburton grant then, that what *Herodotus* told of *Sesostris*, was by the active Priesthood of *Egypt corrupted*, and the same Conquests given to *Osiris* with *all their Circumstances*? For *Diodorus*, as Mr. Warburton owns, copied from their *Annals*, p. 211; And therefore He was not the Author of this *Corruption*. Nor is it likely to be a *Grecian Addition*, because the *Egyptians* themselves were famous for their "*extravagant Chronology*," and themselves had invented a History of above 30,000 Years, and they were obliged to invent *Names*, as well as *Things*, to fill it up. It was not then, as Mr. Warburton

calls it, “*Mistake that gave Birth to this Corruption in the Egyptian History.*” p. 223. but it was a *National Vanity* that gave Birth to it, and the same Cause supported it. They could not invent *New Countries* to be conquered; nor could they contrive any Thing but what must be taken from the ordinary Occurrences of Life to enlarge upon. When therefore they imputed to *Osiris*, or *Siris*, or *Sirius*, or whatever was the *Egyptian Heroes Name*, certain great Actions, they took their Plan from *Sesostris’s* real Actions, and thus made a Difference in *Time*, when there was none in Person; and this was the true Cause of the Confusion in the Accounts of *Iasis* and *Osiris*. They could not form even in Imagination a more universal Empire than *Sesostris* had made himself Master of: Some therefore imputed to *Osiris*, who was to be a Hero, the Actions of the real *Sesostris*, and thus indulged their Vanity and Invention, by making Two Persons, with two Names, out of one; And upon this Scheme, the *Egyptian Chronology* may be reconciled to Truth. Whereas, if you make *Osiris* and *Sesostris* different Persons, and attribute to each the several Actions

Actions imputed to them by Historians, all is Contradiction and Confusion of Times and Places, and Circumstances.

But Mr. *Warburton* says, “ that no one can in good Earnest believe, that *Egypt* was indeed emerging out of a State of Barbarity, at the Time in which Sir *Isaac* places *Sesostris*.” p. 226. Nor do I know, that Sir *Isaac* supposes, or ever thought of, any such Thing. He supposes indeed, that *Egypt* was, and had been miserably harrassed with Wars ; conquer’d by the *Shepherds* ; the *Shepherds* again drove out of a great Part of *Egypt* by One King, and quite drove out by his Successor ; then he supposes *Ammon* to reign ; and this takes up one hundred Years. Then comes *Sesac*, and he reigns to a great Age, and sets up one of the greatest Empires that ever had been. Here is nothing like *Egypt*’s “ emerging out of Barbarity,” but emerging out of a Scene of Subjection to Foreigners, and acquiring a vast Extent of Dominion. When therefore Mr. *Warburton* thinks it unlikely, that *Sesostris* could “ divide the Lands of *Egypt* amongst the People, reserving an Annual Rent to the Crown ;” and imagines

it improbable, "because we are certain this
 " was done long before him by the Patri-
 " arch *Joseph*;" ---Why might it not have
 been done by *Sesostris*, as well as by *Joseph*,
 especially since *Egypt* had suffer'd such
 great Alterations and Changes betwixt *Jo-
 seph's* and *Sesostris's* Time? But I shall have
 Occasion to consider this Matter again by
 and by.

From an Argument founded upon a
 mere *Supposition*, Mr. *Warburton* says, "if
 " the Case required, we should not want
 " positive Arguments, supported by the
 " soundest Part of Antiquity, to prove their
 " Difference of Person." p. 227. which,
 since he has been so good as to oblige the
 World with, let us consider them.

His first is taken from the *Time*, when
Hero Worship was first instituted; and it is
 to shew, that *Osiris* was as antient "as the
 " sober Chronologists suppose." It stands
 thus, --- " Hero Worship was as early as
 " the first Institution of civil Policy; there-
 " fore the using the Name of *Osiris* to this
 " Purpose, is *Demonstration*, that he was
 " as early as the sober Chronologists suppose."
 p. 227.

He then adds, that “*Hero Worship* was substituted, and came after *Planet Worship.*” Now let me add, but “*Hero Worship* was as early as the first Institution of *Civil Policy*; Therefore *Planet Worship* was before the first Institution of *civil Policy.*” This I suppose may be denied with great Justice; nor can Mr. Warburton prove, that *Hero Worship* was as early as the first Institution of *civil Policy*; nor that *Hero Worship* came after *Planet Worship.*

But this will deserve a little further Enquiry. It was conceived by Epiphanius and others, that the Beginning of Idolatry was in *Serug’s Time.* What particular Evidence they had for this, I know not; but it consisted then in having only *pictured or coloured Objects:* They had not arrived to *Images made of Wood, or Stone, Silver or Gold.* Epiphanius’s Words are, speaking of *Serug’s Time,* (o) “Then began Idolatry amongst Men, as we have it by Tradition. For as yet

(a) Καὶ ἦρχατο εἰς ἀνθρώπους οὐκ ἐιδωλολατεῖα, — ὡς οὐκ ἐλέγεσσα εἰς οἵμας γυνῶσις πεσείχει. “Ουπω δὲ ἐν ξεδόνοις, καὶ ἐν τοράσαις λίθαιν οὐκ ξύλων οὐδηγυρεστεύκταν, οὐχ χρύσκ, οὐκ ἔξ αλλης τινὸς ὑλης πεποιημένων: μόνον δὲ διὰ χρεωμάτων καὶ εἰκόνων οὐ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου διάνοια ἐφ’ ἐαυτῇ πνευσκε τὴν γανκιάν. Epiph: Hæres. p. 7.

“ the

" the Mind of Man had not discovered
 " the Mischief of carved Images and graven
 " or polished Stones, or Wood, or Silver
 " or Gold, or any other Substance, but
 " only of what was made by *Colours* or
 " *painted Resemblances.*" Two Generations
 after in Serug's Grandson's Time, (b) Im-
 ages of Men were made of *Clay* by the Potter's
 Art. *Tharra* was the Inventor of this. So
 that Painting, or Colouring of Things, was
 the Beginning of Idolatry; and in a little
 Time after the Potter made Images of Clay;
 and these were the first Images of Gods,
 that we read of.

Eusebius speaking of this very Serug, tho'
 he makes him, by some Mistake, of the Fa-
 mily of Japhet, observes, that he began the
 worship of many Gods (c) "For He, and Those

(b) Ἐγεῦθεν γέγονεν ἀνδειαντοπλασία ἀπὸ πυλεργίας
 καὶ περιεπικῆς ἐπισήμης διὰ τῆς τῷ Θάρρῳ τέλε τέχνης.
 ibid. p. 8.

(c) Σεργχ, ὃς εἰς πρῶτος ἤρξατο τὴν Ἑλληνισμόν, καὶ τὴν
 δόγματος τῆς εἰδωλολατείας. Αὐτὸς γάρ, καὶ ὁ σὺν αὐτῷ
 τὰς πάλαι γενομένας ἢ πολεμισάς ἢ ἡγεμόνας, καὶ τὶ προ-
 Σεύσας ἀνδειας ἢ ἀρετῆς ἀξίου ἐν τῷ βίῳ τοῦ μνημανεύσο-
 θαι, καὶ ὡς ὄντας αὐτῶν περιπλορεῖς ἀνδειάσι σηλᾶν ἐτί-
 μοσαν, καὶ ὡς θεός περισεκύνουν αὐτὸς, καὶ ἐδυσίαζον. Οἱ
 δὲ μετὰ ταῦτα ἀνθεώποι ἀγνοοῦσις τὴν τῶν περιγόνων
 γνῶμην, ὅτι ὡς περιπάτοες καὶ ἀγαθῶν ἐνεργεῖς ἐτίμοσαρ
 μνήματις μόνας, ὡς θεός ἐπεργενίας ἐτίμων, καὶ ἐδυσίαζον
 αὐτοῖς. Euseb. Chron. l. i. p. 13.

" who

" who lived in his Time, honoured those that
" were before him, whether they were
" Warriors, or Governors, or did any
" Thing valiantly or bravely, worthy in
" Life to be remembred ; and as being
" their Ancestors they honoured them with
" Statues and Pillars, and paid a Respect
" to them, as if they had been Gods, and
" sacrificed there. But the Men that came
" after, not knowing the Meaning of their
" Ancestors, that they honoured them only
" as their Ancestors, and as Inventors of
" Good Things, with only a Remembrance
" of them, they worshipped them as Ce-
" lestial Gods, and sacrificed to them." He
goes on to describe the Manner, and by
what Steps this Deification was brought to
Perfection : *Their Names were first ordered*
to be put into their sacred Books ; then they
made Feasts at a certain Time in Memory of
them, and said their Souls were gone to the
Isles of the Happy, and were no more to be
judged or burnt with Fire : And that this
Custom continued down to the Time of Tharra,
the Father of Abraham.

There may be some Difficulty in ac-
counting for, or reconciling these different
Accounts

Accounts of antient Idolatry: *Epiphanius* asserting it to be originally *painting* only; *Eusebius* saying it was owing to *Pillars*. Perhaps *Epiphanius* only denied *Gravings*, and Curiosities, or Niceties of Workmanship, whilst the Other speaks of rough, unpolish'd *Pillars*. And thus *Petavius* accounts for the Difficulty.

Tharra was an Image-maker by Profession; and if *Syncellus* tells us Truth, (d) "Abraham burnt his Father's Idols; and "Haran, his Brother, going to put out the "Fire in the Night, was burnt himself." The Idols of his Father were such as he made and sold; and were the Images of Men made in Clay, and baked as Potters do. These were the Images which *Rachel* stole, the *Teraphim*, the Gods that were her Fathers, Gen. xxxi. 19, 30. And that these *Teraphim* were Images of *Men*, and not of *Stars*, seems clear from hence, that *Michal* made up a *Teraphim*, an Image to represent *David* in his Bed.

Epiphanius thinks, that it was (e) "long after" this Idolatry of *Tharra*, that Men

(d) Ἐντίεισαν Αβραὰν τὰ ἔθνα τῷ Πατέρᾳ αὐτῶν, συνεπάθη αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἀρραγ Σέλων σβέσαι τὸ πῦρ εἰς αὐτοὺς. *Syncellus*, p. 99.

(e) Μετέπειδα πολλῶν τῷ χειρὶ. *Epiph.* ib.

worshipped

worshipped *Saturn* and *Jupiter*, and *Ops* and *Juno*; &c. and no doubt so it was. As to *Planet Worship*, not a Word of it is so much as mentioned till a great while after this; never till after the Departure of the Children of *Israel* out of *Egypt*. So that why Mr. *Warburton* should so positively fix *Hero Worship* to be *after Planet Worship*, when this is no where mentioned till some hundred Years after that, I yet can see no Reason.

Mr. *Warburton's* next Point is, that *Planet Worship* was *before* the first Institution of Civil Policy. This likewise is a Point that should be proved from certain *Facts*; but which Mr. *Warburton* has not attempted to do.

A third Point, which Mr. *Warburton* has attempted to shew is, that *Hero Worship* was posterior to *Planet Worship*: but by what means? By the Authority of Men, not one of which lived within so much as *thirteen hundred* Years after the times of Idolatry were begun. Nor is their Authority of any Sort of Weight, where we can go much nearer to the Fountain Head. But let us suppose all these Points proved; did *all Hero Worship*

Worship begin with *Civil Policy*? Did it do so in *Egypt*? If it did, then *Osiris* must have lived as early as the first Institution of Civil Policy in *Egypt*; *i. e.* before at least *Abraham's* Journeys into *Egypt*; for in his time there was a *Civil Policy* in that Country. Now which are the “*sober Chronologists*,” whom we are to follow? Those, who regard the Annals of the Priests of *Egypt*, who extended backwards, or *brought down* their History as they pleased; or those who have rejected all their fabulous Accounts which run out beyond the beginning of the World? What if *Hero Worship* did begin with Civil Policy? Did it not *continue after* Civil Policy was begun? How then are we to fix *Osiris's* Age, since *Hero Worship* began before *Abraham's* time, and continued to the *Argonautic Expedition*, *i. e.* upon the common Schemes of Chronology unrectified, at least seven hundred Years? Was *Osiris* the *first* that was deified in *Egypt*? Might he not be one of the last? Or were not *Vulcan*, *Helius*, *Agathodæmon* and *Saturn* before him? And did not these reign 866 Years before *Osiris*, if you follow *Manetho*, the *Egyptian Priest's Account*? Or might not

not he or his Son *Orus* be the last? Or might not the Humour of deifying Men continue there, to the times when Men and Women brought the Trade into *Europe*, and stock'd the Heavens with mortal Men? What sort of a *Demonstration* then is this that *Osiris* lived as early as he is usually placed by common Chronologers?

We have a *Second*, “*a demonstrative Proof*, “ of their [*Isis* and *Osiris*,] being the *common Benefactors* of all *Egypt*, in the In-“ vention of Corn, Wine, and Civil Poli-“ cy, as the *Egyptian Annals* deliver. Their “ other Hero Gods, as *particular and partial* “ Benefactors, being worshipped *variously*. “ But this fixes them in their high Anti-“ quity.” p. 217, 18. These *great lying* *Egyptian Annals*, should not be urged too far, especially when a *demonstrative Proof* of any fact in History depends upon them. It is true, that *Herodotus* tells us, *that no Gods besides Isis and Osiris were worshipped by all the Egyptians in the same unvaried Manner*. But nothing will hence follow, except that these Persons reigned over *all Egypt*. We now know that the Dynasties of *Egypt* were not successive, but contemporary: And that

“ *all*

" all Egypt had no common King before
" the Expulsion of the Shepherds who reigned
" ed in the lower Egypt," as Sir Isaac ob-
served: The Shepherds were reduced by
Misphragmuthosis, and quite expelled by
Amosis, who extended his Dominion over
all Egypt: His Son extended his Con-
quests; and his Grandson was the Con-
queror of *Aethiopia*, *Libya*, *Arabia*, and
all *Asia*. And he lived in an Age when
Deification was the Fashion. He might
therefore be worshipped by all Egypt in
the same manner; how differently soever
they paid their Worship to their particular
Nomal Heroes: and in consequence, nei-
ther difference of Person nor difference of
Time, nor high Antiquity is at all affected
by this " *demonstrative Proof.*"

But after all, what are these *Egyptian*
Annals here appealed to for the high Anti-
quity of *Osiris*? Where are they to be
found? Are they not *Forgeries* made after
that the *Greeks* were in Possession of *Egypt*?
Were they not " the Product of some Age
" between *Herodotus* and *Diodorus Siculus*,
" and supported by the Evidence of pre-
" tended antient Monuments?" Mr. War-

burton

burton imagines the Story of *Osiris's Expeditions*, as told by *Diodorus*, to be such an Invention, p. 221. and whether the Story of his "high Antiquity" might not come out of the same Forge, or whether it were the Invention of that active and learned Priesthood before that time; I shall leave to further Enquiry.

When we are told that their being "common Benefactors of all *Egypt* in the Invention of Corn, &c. fixes them in their HIGH ANTIQUITY,"---Does *high Antiquity* imply the Age that *Manetho* places them in; i. e. before the *Flood*, reckoning his *Sixteen Dynasties* as short as you please? Or is it a time before *Joseph's Days*, when we know *Corn* was well known in *Egypt* and used? Or how is it proved to be so early as the Death of *Joshua*? For it has not yet been proved that the *Egyptians* had found out that the Year consisted of 365 Days, so early as that; and *Osiris* was *ουγγενης ιησεας*; not born *before* the Day, but *with* the time in which they added the additional five Days to the Year.

Mr. *Warburton* produces a third Argument: "The Calf and Ox are own'd to be

" the peculiar Symbols of *Osiris*: but the
 " Golden Calf I have proved to be an *E-*
 " *gyptian* Symbol, therefore *Osiris* at least as
 " old as *Moses*." p. 228. That the *Calf* or
Ox were *Egyptian* Symbols is true; and that
 the *Egyptians* worship'd some of their Kings
 or Benefactors under that Representation is
 certain: And that the Golden Calf might be
 made by *Aaron* from the Model of *Egypt*, is
 most probable; and consequently that the
Egyptian Symbol of an Ox or Calf to repre-
 sent some deified Person was as old as *Moses*,
 is granted. The only Points that should
 have been proved were, that these Symbols
 were " *peculiar to Osiris*;" and that *Osiris*
 lived as early as *Moses*. A reason is easily
 to be assigned why *Osiris* (supposing him and
Sesostris to be the same) was worshipped;
 under that Symbol: but that it was " *pecu-*
 " *liar to Osiris*," supposed to be a distinct
 Person from *Sesostris*, to be so worshipped;
 or that it did not denote some other Bene-
 factor different from and prior to *Osiris*, is
 the Point to be proved. *Vossius* (f) is strong-
 ly of Opinion, that *Joseph* was represented
 by the *Egyptians* under that Figure; and he

(f) *Vossius de Idolol.* Lib. i. c. 29.

has

has with him several of the Antients that were in that Notion: and he shews by several Arguments, that a more proper Symbol could not have been invented for so great a Benefactor; so much honoured by the King: And he has very well observed, that even the *Romans* expressed their Sense of Kindness done them by the Distribution of *Corn* among them, by giving *L. Minucius* a *Golden Ox*. The Invention of the Symbol was certainly very antient; but that it was “peculiar to “*Osiris*,” and thence to draw an Argument of *Osiris*’s Age; and to make him as antient at least, as that Symbol, is too much to be taken for granted in this Place: The Ox seems at first to have been the Symbol of *Agriculture*; then of the Person, whoever he was that improved Agriculture; afterwards it was the Symbol of (*g*) *Sesostris* or *Osiris*, who taught his conquer’d Subjects, either Agriculture, or to plough with *Oxen*.

The fourth Reason is taken from a Concession made by Sir *Isaac*: --- “Our great Author owns, that the King, who invented Agriculture in Egypt, seems to

(*g*) Καὶ δὲ τὸν Ἀιδονίαν διδάσκαλα τὸς ἀνθρώπους τὰ πεδία τὴν γεωγραφίαν. Diod. Sic. l. i. p. 16.

" have been worshipped by his Subjects in
" the Ox or Calf for his Benefaction. Now
" the Ox or Calf was the Symbol of Osiris.
" But Agriculture we certainly know was
" invented before the Time of Joseph,
" which will bring us to seek for Osiris 700
" Years higher than Sesostris, who is our Au-
" thor's antient Osiris or Sesostris." *ibid.*

Here again Mr. Warburton takes for granted, that the Ox or Calf were so peculiarly the Symbols of Osiris, that they were never applied to any one besides. Does he not see, that Sir Isaac, in the Passage here quoted, guesses, that *the King, who by his Invention first peopled the lower Part of Egypt, and reigned over it, perhaps the King of Mesir, where Memphis was afterwards built, seems to have been worshipped by his Subjects after Death in the Ox or Calf for his Benefaction?* The lower Part of Egypt being yearly overflowed by the Nile, was little useful to any Inhabitants, before it was made capable of bringing forth Corn; or maintaining its own People. The Seasons therefore were necessary to be observed; the Overflowings, and the Abatements of the Nile; the Opportunities of Sowing and Reaping;

Reaping ; the proper Pasturage of Cattle,--- These, and such like Benefactions, of Him who discover'd these Things, occasioned the Worship of some King of *Lower Egypt* at first. His Name, as a proper Name, seemed not to have been *Osiris*, for none such was in Being ; but an Ox, or Calf, שׂוֹר was set up, as the Symbol of so good a Benefactor : And this Name long afterwards was appropriated to him who was the great Conqueror of the World, and who taught the conquer'd Nations, West and South, to plough with *Oxen*. Agriculture therefore might have been 700 Years in the World, or twice as much, before *Sesostris's* Age ; and yet that will not prove, either that *Sesostris* might not be worshipped in an *Ox* ; nor that Posterity might not appropriate that Symbol to Him, which had been before applied to others.

But let us see at what Time these Masters of their Trade have fixed their Dynasty of *Gods* and *Demigods*, and how long that lasted.

Manetho, the *Sebennyte*, has given us an Account of Sixteen Dynasties of *Egypt* ;

but before any of these began, were the Dynasties of their Gods and Demigods.

Vulcan reigned — — 724 Years $\frac{1}{2}$, and 4 Days.

Helius, Son of Vulcan, 86 Years.

Agathodemon — — 56 Years $\frac{1}{2}$, and 10 Days.

Saturn — — — 40 Years and a half.

Osiris and Isis — — 35 Years.

The Sixth is not named.

Typhon — — — 29

971 Years, 6 M. 14 Days.

Orus, a Demigod — 25 Years.

Mars, a Demigod — 23

Aniubis, a Demigod — 17

Hercules, a Demigod — 15

Apollo, a Demigod — 25

Ammon, a Demigod — 30

Tithoes, a Demigod — 27

Sofus, a Demigod — 32

Jupiter, a Demigod — 20

214

All these, our Chronologers, (reckoning them, as they must be 4 or 5000 Years before the Flood) have justly placed to the Account of the *Fabulous Chronology* of

Egypt.

Egypt. Nor has the Exactness of Months and Days, as well as Years, which the Gods reigned, made these Records of that *active* and *learned Priesthood* gain any Sort of Credit with the *judicious*. *Osiris* and *Isis* are here fixed to a Time, when it is on all Hands agreed they could not live. If therefore they are reckon'd in the Number of their Gods; and it is certain, that they did not live at the Time, where they placed them; and it is certain too, that they deified their deceased Kings and Benefactors;— must we not look for them at a Time, when the Deification of Mortals was the Practice of a Country? And if we can find among their Kings, or great Men, any one, whose Actions are the same, or similar to His who is deified, may we not conclude, that the God and the Mortal were the same Person. And is it any Objection, that the Chronology does not agree, when upon all Schemes, either *Osiris* is a mere fictitious Person, or you must place him where his Actions will suit with the Nature of Things, and Circumstances of History, tho' it be a thousand, or 1500 Years later than the Priests of *Egypt* had placed him. And sup-

pose, that we are allowed to look for him before Joseph's Days ; or suppose, as late as Joshua's Days ; whatever will justify our looking so low, will justify our descending much lower, even as late as Solomon's or Rehoboam's Days ; if the Circumstances of History and Times will then agree to him.

It is certain, that *Osiris* did not live at the Time where the *Egyptians* placed him : And the Names of the Gods that reigned before him, *Helius* and *Agathodæmon*, are Greek Names, which in those early Days were not, could not, be given to *Egyptian* Gods. If ever therefore, by examining History, we can find a Mortal that certainly did the Actions imputed to the God, we must bring such God from his High Antiquity ; especially since we know the Practice of the *Egyptian* Priests, who were wont to extend their History *backwards* to such an unreasonable Length of Time. *Osiris* is perhaps no more than a corrupt, ill pronounced, *Egyptian* Word ; and not the proper Name of any one. Whether it was derived from שֹׁׂר, an Ox, because *Sesostris* taught his conquer'd People to plough with Oxen ; or whether it is an *Aethiopian* Word, and

and given to the Conqueror from his coming from *Egypt* up the *River Nile* to invade them (for they called the *Nile* (*a*) *Siris*) or whether it comes from any other Words, I think we can hardly say with any Certainty. But if the *Egyptians* deified a Hero of theirs, under the Title of *Osiris*, a Name by which he was called, either by his Neighbours the *Aethiopians*, or from his Benefaction to his Acquists, by teaching them Agriculture,--- this was a good Contrivance to conceal the Mortal under a Name, which he obtained as a God; and the only Difficulty is to find out the Hero, who was deified under such a Name. Now when so many Circumstances agree to *Sesostris*, which Sir *Isaac* has, with a peculiar Sagacity, laid together, one cannot much doubt, but *Osiris* was the Name of the God, whom Mortals call'd *Sesostris*.

But let us suppose with Mr. *Warburton*, that We are to look for *Osiris* before *Joseph's* Days, shall we not then throw more Confusion upon all that is tolerably clear, than

(a) Ἐνθεν πιοτάτοιο κατέρχεται ὕδατα Νέλε
“Ος δὴ τοι Λιβύης εἰπ’ αὐτολίνη πολὺς ἔργων
Σίεις ωπ’ Αιθιόπων κικλήσκεται.

Dionys. Perieg. v. 221.

we had before. It was but in p. 189, that Mr. Warburton agrees, that the Fable of the Birth of the Five Gods, *Osiris*, *Isis*, *Typho*, *Orus*, and *Nephthe*, "could not be invented before the Egyptians had found out that the Year consisted of 365 Days;" and this He supposes to be "a little after the Death of Joshua." The learned Mr. Shuckford had argued from that Fable, that these Gods were not deified before they knew that the Year had these five Days added to it. But Mr. Warburton denies this Consequence; and pretends, that the five Gods were deified before this Addition to the Year, and says, the Fable was made to commemorate the Insertion of the five Days. But that which shews, that *Osiris* was not prior to the Addition of these *επαγόμεναι*, or Addition of the five Days, is, (if any Credit is to be given to the Pillars said to be found at *Nysa* in *Arabia*) that in them, He is said to be, *αυγγενης ιητεξες*, born at the very Time when these Days were found necessary to compleat the Year; and consequently long after Joseph's Death; nay, and after Moses's Death too.

No Time then being at all agreed on, wherein *Osiris* lived, the Point is to enquire, who was the Man, to whom the *Egyptians* gave that Name? Who is it, and when did he live, who was so much talked of in *Egypt*? Mr. *Warburton* has made a Digression to “discover the general Cause “ of all the mistaken Identities of Persons, “ by tracing down the Religion of *Greece* “ from its Original.” p. 229. But this answers not the Point. There was some One Person in *Egypt*, called *Bacchus* or *Dionysus*; and the same Person was called *Osiris*, by the Consent, as Sir *Isaac* observes of all Antiquity. This is affirmed “ by the *Egyptians*, as well “ as by the *Greeks*, and some of the Antient “ Mythologists, as *Eumolpus* and *Orpheus*, “ called *Osiris* by the Name of *Dionysus*.” p. 193. How a Discourse, which traces down the Origin of the Religion of *Greece*, can help us in this Affair, I own I do not see. Had the Question been,---whence the *Greeks* derived their *Bacchus*, or *Dionysus*, then it would have been proper to have shewn, from whence the tutelary Gods, or the Names of the tutelary Gods of *Greece*, came. But here the Debate is, Who was the

the Person called in *Egypt Osiris*, or *Dionysius*, and when he lived? Sir Isaac thinks him from many Circumstances, all concurring, that *Sesostris* was the Person intended. And to prove this, he shews, that That *Bacchus* (whoever he was) or *Osiris*, was famous for doing the very Things which made *Sesostris* famous: “*Bacchus*, or *Osiris*, “ was contemporary with *Sesostris*, and both “ were Kings of *Egypt*, potent at Sea, “ great Conquerors, and carried on their “ Conquests into *India* and *Thrace*; there-“ fore they must be one and the same “ Man.” Let the *Greeks* then derive their *Bacchus* from *Egypt*, or *India*; or let them fetch the *Name* from whom you please, Mr. Warburton owns, that *Bacchus* “ was “ but Two Generations earlier than the “ *Trojan War*,” and as he did all the Ac- tions of his Contemporary, and was King of the same Country, they must be one, and the same Man.

The next Attack upon Sir Isaac is; That whereas “ he [Sir Isaac] considers the Ge- “ nealogies of their Gods and Heroes, and “ finds them to co-incide with the Time “ of *Sesostris*;”—This he thinks to be “ a “ Confirmation,

" Confirmation, and further Evidence of
" the Truth of his Opinion." D. L. p. 244.
And is it not remarkable, that there should
be such a *Co-incidence?* Is it not very sur-
prising, that at a Time, when so many Fables
were invented and contrived to confound all
Truth and Knowledge; when there was so
much Confusion and Contradiction, not only
of Places, but of Times and Persons;
when such a Darkness as might be felt,
appeared on the Face of Antiquity; yet
That great Genius found out a Clue that
guided him thro' that Labyrinth, and made
him able to shew others, who were willing
to travel, how they might with Pleasure
and Profit go thro' that unknown Land.

What is it now to the Purpose to enquire
into the Causes of all this Confusion? Be
the *Sources* of it, all that Mr. Warburton
has labour'd to shew; and let *Antiquity*,
as he expresses it, "*sink and founder itself*
"in the treacherous Soil of Mythology,"
p. 250, Yet if any Co-incidence of Facts,
unobserved by any Body before Sir Isaac,
will help us out of this Mire, and give us
Footing upon a sure Bottom, the greater
Honour

Honour is due to him who made the Discovery.

But it seems, "the greatest Part of Sir Isaac's Reasoning from these Genealogies is on an Error of his own. Sir Isaac, who supposed,---that the Gods and Goddesses left of getting and bearing Children when they died, concludes from the Mythologic Account of their Offspring, that they must needs have lived but two or three Generations before the War of Troy. --- It being notorious, that every Age of the Pagan World swarmed with the Progeny of their Gods, Sir Isaac's Conclusion from the Time of their Sons and Grandsons to their own is altogether fallacious." p. 250, 251.

To prove this to have been the Case, we have this Affair traced up to the "Original," and all the Causes assigned of Pretences to Offspring from the Gods produced. The first Cause was the Contrivance of Wives to hide their Adulteries, and of Virgins to excuse their Incontinence. A Second was the Ambition of this pretended Offspring themselves, in order to support their Authority amongst their barbarous Followers,

lowers. A Third was the Flattery of Sycophants. The Last is, that it was a mere Figure of Speech in the Eastern Phraseology. Allowing now this to be all true: Does Mr. Warburton infer, that the Persons worshipped by the *Pagan* World were not real Persons, infamous for their perpetual Intrigues? Because some Wives or Virgins might contrive Excuses for their Incontinence, did not *Jupiter* of Crete, or *Bacchus*, or any such *quondam* Men or Heroes, indulge themselves in Amours? And if they did, may you not with Probability argue from the Time of Sons or Grandsons, to the Time of Fathers or Grandfathers? Sir Isaac finds, when he considers the Genealogies of the Gods and Heroes of the Antients, that they coincide with the Time of *Sesostris*, --- This is one Circumstance: He finds all the Actions reported of a God *Bacchus*, to agree exactly with *Sesostris*, --- This is another Fact: He finds, that the Offspring of *Bacchus*, his Sons, were *Argonauts*, --- This is a third Fact. Now the *Argonautic* Expedition, being one Generation later than *Sesostris*, this is certainly a good co-incident Circumstance, which helps to

to fix the Age of *Sesostris* or *Bacchus*. If indeed the Plea of being the Son of a God were to stand single, and no other Circumstances concurred to fix a *Chronological Point* but that one, perhaps some or other of the Reasons here assigned by Mr. *Warburton* might be sufficient to destroy all Dependance upon an Argument deduced from the Age of the Son, to the Age of the Hero, said to beget him: As it might justly be urged; that you could not fix the Age of *Mars* from the fix'd Age of *Romulus*. But yet, when Circumstances *co-incide*; when the Age of the Father, and his Circumstances agree very well, and tally with the Age of the Son; when Times agree with the respective Ages of the Offspring, and of the God or Goddess; and when you have nothing besides that prevents or excludes Assent, there it may be very safe to infer the Time of the Father, from the Time of the Son. It is very well known, that *Romulus* was born of *Rhea Sylvia* by a Father unknown: There are several Ways of saying or understanding, that he was begot by *Mars*; and consequently it does not follow, that *Mars* the God was the certain Father

Father of *Romulus*, or was but one Generation prior to *Romulus*. But supposing, that you are not led by any other Circumstances, to conclude a Child not to be the Son of any God or Goddess; but to be really descended from such a Person who has been deified; such Offspring, and a Chronology fixt upon such Principle, is not to be rejected, because Tricks have been play'd; and Contrivances used; to conceal Incontinence? A Son of *Apollo* may be no more than a Poet, or a Musician; as a Son of *Mars* may be no more than a Hero in martial Atchievements: A Son of *Venus* may be no more than one begot in a Commerce secret on any Girl. But when *Aeneas* is declared to be the Son of *Venus* by *Anchises*, and *Venus* appears to have been the Mistress or Wife of *Cinyras*, a Person who lived in those Times, no Reason can be given; why *Venus* Herself should not be thought to have been the real, proper Mother of *Aeneas*: How odd would it have been for the old Apologists to have used this Argument against the *Pagans*, if they had not conceived the *Pagan* Gods really to have had some Children? And

how easily might the *Pagans* in their Turns have answered this Argument, by urging the figurative Sense of such Expressions, as the Son of *Venus*, *Bacchus*, *Apollo*, &c.? But both Heathens and Christians understood this Affair in a true, literal Sense; and then it is as easy, in such Case, to argue from Sons or Grandsons to the Times their Sires lived in, as it is in any other Case to argue from Father to Son or Grandson, and thence to compute the Distance of their Ages.

I know not how it is with you, or with others, but as soon as I have read over all that Mr. *Warburton* has said against Sir *Isaac Newton*'s Chronology, and I look into Sir *Isaac* a second Time, imagining, that I had laid hold of something that would guard me against any Fallacies, I know not what is the Matter, but all Assent is gone, and I am just in the Condition I was before I began to read. Mr. *Warburton* charges his Adversary indeed with false Facts, mistaken Conclusions, Confusion, Contradiction to the History and Astronomy of the Bible, to the Nature of Things, and to himself. But these are meer *Words* which leave no Manner of Impression;

Impression; but vanish as soon as I begin to look into Sir Isaac's Book. I see in That none of the Contradictions to *History*, none to great Probability; and as to any Contradiction to the *Astronomy* of the Bible, even Mr. Warburton has not once attempted to shew it, tho' it stands as an Accusation against Sir Isaac in the Beginning of this Chapter.

But I shall proceed next to consider the Consequences with which Mr. Warburton charges our great Author. These are divided into what *He would not venture to admit*, and those which *he would*. Now both these,---directly CONTRADICT Scripture, and the Nature of Things. So that, as we before proved, the Error of his Conclusion from the Falshood of his Premisses, we now begin at the other End, and shall prove the Falshood of his Premisses from the Error of his Conclusion. p. 255.

First then, Mr. Warburton considers some Consequences, which Sir Isaac, "for their " apparent Falshood, was obliged to pass " over in Silence." Now if they are "appar- " rently false," one would not be much surprized, that Sir Isaac passed them over

in Silence. But what are these? Why, it seems, " those very Histories; on which " Sir Isaac builds his Identity, tell us, that " Osiris invented the Culture of the Vine; " and abolished the Custom his Savage Sub- " jects had of *eating one another*: That his " Wife and Sister Isis taught them to *sow* " Corn, and gave them their first System of " Laws: That they were both the Patrons " of *Nascent Arts*; and that all the In- " struments of Husbandry were found out " in their Time." Suppose now, that those very Histories, which tell us Things which are " apparently false," tell us other Things which are apparently *true*, --- do they not stand upon the Foot that other Histories, all Histories, do? Suppose one were to appeal to *Herodotus* for the Truth of any Fact; would it be a Confutation of that, to cite any Mistake of *Herodotus* about it; and then to say, that That very History tells us a false, idle, groundless Story, which tells us what is cited from him as Truth? Historians tell us inconsistent Things about *Osiris*, or any other Person. Is the Consequence this, that nothing is at all to be believed about him? Or may not a Distinc-
tion

tion be made betwixt what is apparently true, and apparently false?

The very Historians; on which Sir Isaac builds his Identity of Osiris and Sesostris, tell us the *Inventions of Osiris*. Very true.
 " But if *Osiris* were Sir Isaac's *Sesostris*, all these fine Discoveries were made but two Generations before the *Trojan War*, and full 500 Years after the *Exodus*; and then, --- What are we to think of the Bible?" The Question is not, What are we to think of the Bible, but what are we to think of those "authentic Annals of that active and learned Priesthood," copied by Diodorus? Are we obliged to believe Diodorus, or any one in Things "apparently false?" But Sir Isaac is obliged "either to receive the Consequences he has rejected, or to reject those he has received; or lastly, to shew, that they stand upon different Authority." p. 257. All this goes upon this Supposition, that Sir Isaac had no other Authority for what he had said about Sesostris and Osiris, but only one Diodorus. How many other Authors are cited for the Facts of Osiris and Sesostris, besides Diodorus? And the Point is to reconcile these

several, discordant Stories. *Herodotus* tells us of the Conquests of *Sesostris*: *Diodorus* tells of the same Conquests of *Osiris*. *Strabo* too tells us of the Conquests of *Sesostris*. Where now is the Inconsistency of rejecting some Things said by *Diodorus*, which are “apparently false,” at the same time, that one admits other Things, which are agreeable to what the Bible and other Historians relate? The Conquests made by *Osiris* are certainly the very same Conquests which *Sesostris* made; and as they were but once made, *Osiris* and *Sesostris* must be the same Person. Thus far then *Diodorus* may be trusted in his Account of *Osiris*; because other Historians give the same Account of the Conquests, only using a different Name. But then if *Diodorus* adds what cannot be true, I do not see, that any one is obliged to admit that, tho’ he does admit other Things that may be true.

But Sir Isaac had the Misfortune to admit that Part of the Sicilian's Account, which had the very least Foundation. “If one Part of the Sicilian's Account be of better Authority than the other, it is that which says, *Iris invented Agriculture*. For he expressly

" expressly tells us, that this was found
 " written on a large Column in *Hieroglyphic Characters*, half consumed with Age,
 " then standing in the City of *Nysa* in
 " *Arabia.*" p. 257.

You must not imagine from this positive Assertion of Mr. Warburton, that *Diodorus* ever *saw* this Column, or *read* the Inscription, or "expressly tells us" any such Thing. He tells us only what others *reported*, either to be written on the Pillar, or to be impossible to be read, through Length of Time. And as he "expressly tells" the Story in this Manner; it is certain, First, That he never *saw*, nor pretends to have seen, the Pillar itself. Secondly, Supposing such a Pillar to be standing at *Nysa* in *Arabia* some time or other, this will prove *Osiris* not to have lived before some *Egyptian* King had conquer'd *Arabia*. And which of the *Egyptian* Kings did this before the Times of *Sesostris*, I leave you to find out. Thirdly, Mr. Warburton tells us, that these Pillars were written "in *Hieroglyphic Characters.*" I suppose he did this, because the Pillars should appear of very great Antiquity. But his Author does not say in *Hieroglyphic Characters,*

Characters, but ἐν ἱερήις γραμμαῖς, in *Sacred Letters*, that is in an *Alphabetic Character*. Now this Sort of Writing was not in *Osiris's* Times in *Egypt*, if you place *Osiris* so early as Mr. *Warburton* would place him. Lastly, As to *Osiris* himself, he is said to be οὐγένειος ἡμέραις, born at the same time with THE DAY : That is, he was contemporary with the Introduction of the *five Days*, which were found necessary to complete the Solar Year, on one of which *Osiris* was brought forth by *Rhea*; which shews him not so early as *Joseph*, no, nor so early as *Joshua*; and I think it was as late as *Solomon's Days*.

But what after all is the *Sicilian's Account* that is of such *Authority*? Why, it stands thus, “*I am not ignorant, that some Writers tell us, that the Sepulchres of these Gods [Isis and Osiris] are in Nysa in Arabia, from which Place Dionysus is called Nysæus.* And that there is a Pillar erected to each of these Gods, on which, in *Sacred Characters*, is written, &c.” Then he gives us the Inscriptions, which, φασὶ δύνασθαι αράγειν, they SAY can be read. Does He give into this Notion of these Writers?

Writers? Does he credit the Story of these Pillars? Does he approve, or say a Word in Approbation of them? What then is the Sicilian's Account? Or what is it that is of so much *better Authority* in this Place, for *Isis's* Invention of *Agriculture*, than for any other Piece of History, which *Diodorus* relates?

Well, but what is *reported* to be said upon this Pillar concerning *Isis*? “(a) *I*
“*am Queen of ALL the Country. I am Wife*
“*and Sister of King Osiris. I am the first*
“*that found out Fruit for Men.*” When it
is affirmed of *Isis*, that she was *Queen*
of *all* the Country, it must be at a Time
when *Egypt* at least, probably *Egypt* and
Arabia too, was *all* under one Government;
And in Course not before the several Kings
of *Coptos*, *Thebes*, *This*, *Elephantis*, and
other Places, were reduced under one Go-
vernment. She therefore did not live be-
fore the *Shepherds* were drove out of *Egypt*;
and they reigned according to *Josephus* up-
wards of five hundred Years. I think he

(a) Ἔγώ Ἰσις ἐμί εἰ μή οὐ Σικελίων πάσους χάρεσσε.—Ἐγώ
ἐμί γυνὴ καὶ ἀδελφὴ Ὀσιείδος βασιλέως. Ἔγώ εἰ μή εἰ
πρώτη παρθενὸς αὐθεράποτες ἐνέστα. Diod. p. 16.

has much encreased the Number of Years, that the Shepherds reigned over the lower Egypt: However that is not the Point now in Hand. *Iris*, I say, could not be Queen of *all Egypt*, till some time after *Mispbrng-mutbosis*'s Days; nor could she set up a Pillar in *Arabia*, before *Arabia* was conquer'd by *Egypt*; which again could not be before *Sesostris*'s Days; and then *Letters* were known; and all is consistent thus far. But what are we to say to those Words.--- *I am the first that found out Fruit for Men?* Not certainly, that she was the *first* that found out *Corn*: For that was long enough known before Her Days. Nor that She invented *Agriculture*: for that likewise was known and practised before She was Queen of *all Egypt*. This therefore was “ apparently ‘false’ of her, and consequently to be rejected. When therefore *Diodorus* says, that *She found out Wheat and Barley, which grew as other Herbs did about the Country, but was unknown or undistinguished before her Time, and that Osiris contrived the Method of working and managing these Fruits.* --- This, I say, must be owing to some Mistake, perhaps to some double Meaning of a Word, or

or to a Similitude of Words, or some such Cause, which led them to impute the Invention of *Corn-Fruit* to her, instead of the Thing which she really discovered. Perhaps I could make a probable Conjecture, what her Discovery was, consistent with her *Time*; and with what She had a Right to glory in. (b) But as it is but Conjecture, I shall say no more than this,--- that it is “apparently false,” that *Iris invented Agriculture*, let *Diodorus*, or any one else, relate such a Story; and therefore it is to be rejected; and that She lived as late as *Sesostris's Days*, appears from these Pillars, if they are of any Authority; and therefore thus much might be used by Sir *Isaac*, as a proper Evidence, because agreeable and consistent.

The next things considered by Mr. *Warburton* are, “the Consequences which Sir

(b) *Iris* is said to have found out *Fruit* for Men. *Fruit* is כְּרִי. *Pher*; and in the Plural, כְּרִין. *Pherin*. Suppose now that *Iris*, by sending down any Shipping along the *Red Sea*, and then sailing Eastward, had discovered that Country, which is called in Scripture, in the *Phtenitian Dialect*, כְּרָוִין, i. e. the Island *Tarobane*, famous for the finest Gold, and Ivory, and Peacocks, &c.—The Word is the same, or so near the same, that the Mistake is very easy.

"*Isaac* has thought fit to *espouse*, some of which are these, that Instruments of War, Horses for Military Service, Animal Food, the exact Distribution of Property, Alphabetical Letters, and the well peopling of *Egypt*, were all the Product of the Age of *Sesostris*." p. 257-58.

And has Sir *Isaac* really admitted, or *espoused* these Consequences? You will be justly surprised, if I tell you, that Sir *Isaac* never has espoused several of them; nor is there a Word in Sir *Isaac* about them. e. gr.

The very first Consequence here mentioned, That Sir *Isaac* *espouses*, is, that *Instruments of War* were the Product of the Age of *Sesostris*. Does Sir *Isaac* espouse this? No. Mr. *Warburton* himself interprets these *Instruments of War*, not *Swords*, not *Spears*, but "*Armour*," which is very different from what those comprehensive Words, --- "*Instruments of War*," may mean. And supposing "*Instrument's of War*" means "*Armour*," has Sir *Isaac* any where said, that "*Armour*" was the *Product* of the Age of *Sesostris*? No. He expressly speaks of *Armour* as *invented* long before *Sesostris's* time, nay before his Father *Ammon's* time: and

and he is not wont to be guilty of Contradiction. But let us examine the Grounds of this Imputation.

" *Vulcan*, says Sir *Isaac*, reigned in *Cyprus*
" and *Byblus* till a very great Age, living to
" the times of the *Trojan War* --- and after
" the Death of his Wife *Calycopis*, he built
" Temples to her at *Paphos*, and *Amathus*
" in *Cyprus*, and at *Byblus* in *Syria*, and in-
" stituted Priests to her with sacred Rites
" and lustful *Orgia*, whence she became the
" *Dea Cypria* and the *Dea Syria*. --- *Cinyras*
" deified also his Son *Gingris* by the Name
" of *Adonis* -- and for assisting the *Egyptians*
" with *Armour*, it is probable that he him-
" self was deified by his Friends the *Egyp-*
" *tians*, by the Name of *Baal Canaan* or
" *Vulcan*: For *Vulcan* was celebrated prin-
" cipally by the *Egyptians*, and was a King
" according to *Homer*, and reigned in *Lem-*
" *nos*: and *Cinyras* was an Inventor of
" ARTS, and found out Copper in *Lemnos*,
" and the Smith's Hammer and Anvil and
" Tongs and Leaver, and employed Work-
" men in making *Armour* and other things
" of Brass and Iron, and was the only
" King celebrated in History for working
" in

" in Metals, and was King of *Lemnos*; and
 " the Husband of *Venus*: All which are
 " the Characters of *Vulcan*; and the *Egyptians* about the time of the Death of *Cinyras*, viz. in the Reign of their King
 " *Amenophis*, built a very sumptuous Temple
 " at *Memphis* to *Vulcan*, and near it a smaller Temple to *Venus Hospita* --- *Vulcan's Wife.*" *Newton's Chronol.* p. 224-25.

Mr. Warburton's Remark on these Words is, --- " Here we have a Hero living till the time of the TROJAN War, not only the *Inventor of Arms*, but likewise of the very Tools employed in making them." p. 258. Will not the most careless Reader ask, from what Words of Sir Isaac could Mr. Warburton draw this Consequence, that *Vulcan* was the INVENTOR OF ARMS? He is said indeed to be the Inventor of ARTS, which I could fancy Mr. Warburton read ARMS, and confirmed himself in his Mistake by seeing it said, that he assisted the Egyptians with ARMOUR.

That (b) *Cinyras* found out the Smith's Hammer, Tongs, Leaver and Anvil, in *Cyprus*,

(b) *Cinyra* invenit — metalla æris — in Insula Cypro : item forcipem, marculum, Vectem . *Plin. vii. c. 56.*

Pliny

Pliny tells us: But Pliny does not say that *Arms* could not be made without these Tools. It is a groundless Remark of Mr. Warburton, that *Cinyras* found out the *very Tools employed in making them*; insinuating as if *Arms* could never have been made without the Tools invented by *Cinyras*; whereas *Arms* and *Armour* too were *invented*, as is agreed by all, before *Cinyras's Days*; nor is there one Word in Sir *Isaac* to the contrary.

Mr. Warburton goes on to observe, that
“ *Homer* seems indeed to make *Vulcan* the
“ *Inventor of Arms*, but at the same time
“ makes both him and his Invention, the
“ Product of a much earlier Age. By his
“ Poem of the *Trojan War*, it appears that
“ *Military Weapons* had been then long in
“ use.” p. 259. And then he very truly
infers, “ that if *Military Weapons* at the time
“ of the *Trojan War* had been in long use
“ amongst the *Greeks*, it is impossible they
“ should have been but *just invented* in
“ *Egypt*.” p. 260.

But who is here opposed? Has Sir *Isaac* ever said, that *Military Weapons*, or *Arms*, or *Armour*, were but *just invented* either in *Egypt*, or any where else? Sir *Isaac* has indeed

deed said; that “it is probable that Cinyras
“ or Vulcan was deified by his Friends the
“ Egyptians for affiting them with Armour;”
an excellent useful Defence against Arms, or
Military Weapons; but when either Arms;
or Armour were invented, is not so much as
remotely hinted at in this Passage about Vul-
can.

However, let me observe, that Eusebius has this Remark, as it is in Cedrenus, that Vulcan was deified by the Egyptians --- as Plato says, for shewing them the Art of making Warlike and Husbandry Tools of Iron; for before him they fought with Stones and Clubs, ἀλλὰ καὶ ὡς ὁ Πλάτων, πολεμικῶν καὶ γεωργικῶν ἔργαλείων τὴν ἐκ σιδήρου κατασκευὴν αὐτοῖς νοεῖται, λίθοις γαρ καὶ ροπάλοις ἐπολέμεν πεδὲ αὐτῷ. Not that he invented Arms: but “he shewed them how to make certain Instruments of Iron,” as Plato observed.

I cannot but take Notice, that in Homer their Military Weapons were made of no other Metal than Copper, though Iron was the Metal that best would resist such Weapons. Ulysses's Spear was Ἀιχμὴ χαλκεῖη, a Copper-headed Spear. And when with that he had slain Democoon, Apollo cries out

to

CHRONOLOGY vindicated. 305
to the Trojans, to come on against the Greeks,

— Ἐπεὶ δὲ σφι λίθος χρεὸς, καὶ δὲ σιδηρός

Χαλκὸν ἀναγένται τάμεοι χροα. Iliad. l. 509, 510.

because their Bodies were not made of Stone or Iron, to be able to resist Copper. They had indeed found out the Art of heading Clubs with Iron, and *Areithous* was called the Club-Fighter,

Οὐέντ' αὖτε τῷξοισι μαχέσκετο, διεῖ τε μακεῖ,

Ἄλλὰ σιδηρέσιν κορύνη ρίγυνος φάλαγγας. Il. n. 140.

because he did not fight with Arrows, or a long Spear, but broke whole Troops with an Iron headed Club. Iron was then so valuable a Commodity, that it was reckon'd among the Treasures or Riches that a Man had. Accordingly *Adrastus* reckons it as such, *Il. ζ.* And *Achilles* threatens to carry it away with his Gold and Copper from *Troy* to *Phtia*: *Iliad. i. 366.* And afterwards when he was proposing and giving Prizes to the chief Heroes at *Patroclus's Funeral*, one of them was no more than a great heavy Coat of Iron. Now if *Vulcan* had been the Maker of Arms or Military Weapons of Iron, it was certainly a great Improvement, and for which he might have been much esteemed by the Men of War, both for Offence, and Defence.

‘ However, I must own that I do not find that *Vulcan* made his *Armour* of *Iron*. To make *Achilles*'s *Armour* *Vulcan* put into the Fire Copper and Tin, Gold and Silver.

Χαλκὸν δὲ εἰς πυεὶ βάλλειν ἀτέρεα, κασίτεεύτε

Καὶ χρυσὸν τιμῆσθαι, καὶ ἀργυρόν. Il. Σ. 474, 475.

His Sword was made of *Copper*, *χαλκεον*. the Gold and Silver were for Ornaments. And though *Virgil* had made *Iron* a part of the Metals used in furnishing out *Aeneas* to Battle, yet it was only for his *Sword*.

Vulnificusque Chalybs vasta fornace liquevit.

The rest were of *Copper* finely polished, and bright.

But as Sir *Isaac* has not said that *Vulcan* was the *Inventor* of *ARMS*, so I do not remember that in *Homer* he is made the *Inventor* of them. He was famous for making excellent *Armour*, such as *Bucklers*, *Helmets*, *Breast-Plates*, Securities for the *Legs*; things which he made for *Achilles* at the Request of *Thetis*.

— ἀσπίδα καὶ τρυφάλειαν

(n) Καὶ καλὰς κυνηῖδας, ἐποφερίοις ἀεριώτας,

Καὶ θάγην. Ili. Σ. v. 458.

(n): The *Κυνηῖδες* were made of Metal. *Aeneas*'s were, *læves ocreas*, *electro auroque reccoito*. *Aen.* viii. *Achilles*'s, *τεύξει δὲ οἱ κυνηῖδας ἔαντο καστίσσοτο*. Il. Σ. 612. *Hercules* were, *Κυνηῖδας ὁρειχάλκοιο φανεῖ*. *Hesiod. Scut. Herc.* v. 122.

These *Vulcan* gave to *Hercules* the *Argonautic*, as he did his *Shield*. *Ηραΐσκη κλυτὴ δῶρον*: ibid.

And

And the *Breast-plate* that *Agamemnon* wore
was one that *Ginyras* gave him.

————— Σώρηκα πτελί σύνθεσιν ἔδιπε

τὸν πόλε ὁ Κινυρῆς δῶκε ξενήιον εἶναι.

Πεύστε τὸν Κύπρον δὲ μέγα καλέθ, ἐνεκ' Ἀχαιοῖ
Ἐς Τροίην νήσων ἀναπλέυσαθαι ἔμελλον.

Τένεκα ὁ τὸν δῶκε χαειζόμενθ Βασιλῆι. Ili. λ. 19—23.

Instruments therefore of *War*, of all kinds were *invented*; Arms and Armour too, before *Vulcan's Days*. But I suppose the excellency of his Workmanship was such, for Strength as well as Ornament and Use, as might occasion his Deification.

Or if he found out in his latter Days, the Art of working *Iron* well, and of making *Armour* of that Metal, and taught the *Egyptians* to make their *Tools for War and Husbandry* of that Metal in particular, he might be deified on that Account.

Diodorus Siculus tells us (*c*), that *Jupiter* was the first that found out *Suits of Armour*, and that he armed his Soldiers with them: and that he granted the Honour of this Invention to *Mars*; at the same time

(c) Πρῶτον καλεσκυάσσου πανοπλίαν, καὶ τεχνιώτας κα-
θοπλίσαυ. Diod. Sic. Edit. Hanov. p. 341. Scuta gestare
Curetes primi invenerunt. Servius in Virg. Aen. ix. v. 505.

that *Vulcan* had the Honour of the Invention of every thing worked by *Fire*, either in Iron, Copper, Gold or Silver. But whoever really was the Inventor, *Vulcan* was the Person famous in his time for making *Armour* only, not "*Instruments of War*" in general: and this Sir Isaac may and does "espouse," but not that *Instruments of War* were the PRODUCT of *Sesostris's* Age.

It may not be improper to take Notice, that *HodusQ*, the Name by which *Vulcan* is called, is derived from *vn*, *Ignis*, and signifies one that works at the *Fire*: as *Vesta*, *vestia*, comes from the same Original, though it alludes to another Reason. But this by the by.

To prove that Sir Isaac meant that *Vulcan* was the INVENTOR of Arms, Mr. Warburton says, "That this was our Author's meaning is plain, from what he tells us of the Egyptians fighting with *Clubs* in the time of *Sesostris*, which certainly was for want of better Arms; and still plainer from what he tells of *Vulcan's* being made a God, which certainly was for a new Invention." p. 258.

Sir

Sir Isaac says, that “*Sesostris invaded Libya, and fought the Africans with Clubs, and thence is painted with a Club in his Hands; so Hyginus, Afri et Ægyptii pri- mum fustibus dimicaverunt.*” Sir Isaac might have added to this the Authority of *Pliny*, who says, *Prælum Afri contra Ægyptios primi fecere fustibus quos vacant* (a) *Palangas.* l. vii. c. 56. Was this done before the time when *Sesostris* in his Father’s Reign invaded *Libya*? Or when was it that the *Africans* and *Egyptians* first fought with *Clubs*? Did the *Egyptians* invade *Africa* before the time here mentioned? If they did not, you have the Testimony of *Pliny* as well as *Hyginus* to the Fact. But this, says Mr. *Warburton*, “was certainly for want of better Arms.” What if Copper, and Iron too, was found out and worked in *Crete*, and *Lemnos*, and in other Places? Does it follow, that it was carried thence into *Africa*? Or was it carried in such Plenty, that all sorts of *Military Weapons* were made of them? You have a remarkable Instance in Scripture of a Nation, but little before

(a) The Word from whence the Latin Term *Phalanga* or *Palanga* is derived is: פָלָג. *Phalac* which signifies a Club or Stick.

the times we are now speaking of, I mean of the *Jews*, going out against the *Philistines* to Battle, *when there was no Sword or Spear found in the Hand of any of the People that were with Saul and Jonathan, but with Saul and with Jonathan there was found*, 1 Sam. xiii. 22. What now was it that these People were armed with, but *Clubs* and such like *Military Weapons*? As late as *Alexander's Days*, you find a considerable part of the *Derbices* in *Darius's Army*, armed no better than with *Stakes burnt*, and by that means *bardned*. *Quidam*, says *Curtius*, *lignum igni duraverant*. And when *Charidemus* the *Athenian* was giving his Judgment about the Forces of *Alexander*, and describing their Hardiness --- *I suppose*, says he, Ironically, *the Thessalian Horse, and the Acarnanians, and Aetolians*, a Body unconquered in War, will be repelled with your Slings, and *Stakes bardned by Fire*. *Jam Thessali Equites et Arcananes, Aetolique, invicta bello manus, fundis credo et bastis igne duratis repellentur.* Curt. I. iii. c. 2. It does not follow from hence, that Weapons of *Iron* or *Copper* were not found out, or in use, long before these times: Nor does it follow that *Arms*, and

Military

Military Weapons made of Copper, were not before *Vulcan's Days*, who excelled in making *Armour*. In the Army of *Xerxes*, I cannot but observe, that the *Libyans* had not their Military Weapons armed with Iron, or any other Metal; but they used *Darts* or *Javelins burnt and hardened in the Fire*, ἀνοιξιστες σπαρτοις χρεωμενοι. *Herod.* l. vii. c. 71. Not I suppose for want of better *Arms*, for all other Nations that composed that immense Army had their Weapons made of Iron, or at least headed with Iron, or sharp Stone: But the *Libyans* were used to this Sort of Weapons, and best could use them against their Enemies.

Nor does it follow that the *Africans* fought the *Egyptians* with Clubs, "for want" as Mr. *Warburton* says, "of better Arms," but because they were used to fight with Clubs. For *Strabo* mentions a Nation of *Aethiopians* called *Megabari*, who used Clubs headed with Iron, and likewise used Spears and Shields too. *Strab.* l. 16. p. 1122. or 776. And when *Aeneas* came to *Italy* and was engaging with *Turnus*, we find *Cisseus* and *Gyas* in *Virgil* routing whole Troops with Clubs---*Sternentes agmina Clava*,

312 Sir ISAAC NEWTON'S
Dejicit leto. Nibil illos Herculis arma,
Nil valide juvere manus—&c. *Aeneis.* l. 10. v. 319.

So that much after the Days of *Sesostris*, it was not unusual for Nations to fight with Clubs. *Sesostris* therefore might be painted with a Club in his Hand, for his conquering the *Africans* that fought the *Egyptians* with Clubs; or perhaps the *Egyptians* might fight with Clubs as well as the *Africans*; and thence the Conqueror was so painted. It is certain that *Hyginus* and *Pliny* testify the Fact: and the time agrees to *Sesostris*, whatever was the reason of the Fact, which at this Distance of time we can know nothing of, but what Historians or others tell us. But be it what it will, Sir *Isaac* does not ““ espouse” this Consequence, that ““ *Instruments of War* were the PRODUCT of the ““ Age of *Sesostris*. ””

The second Consequence, which Mr. *Warburton* tells us, that Sir *Isaac* espouses, is, ““ That He makes *Sesostris's* Conquest ““ of *Libya* the Occasion of furnishing *Egypt* ““ with *Horses*. ”” p. 261. By this Mr. *Warburton* means, not that *Sesostris's* Conquest of *Libya* was a particular, occasional Circumstance, that furnished *Egypt* with Horses at that time, but it was the first Occasion of *Egypt's* abounding

abounding with Horse. This is what he charges Sir Isaac with espousing; and he grounds his Charge upon these Words.—

“ After the Conquest of *Libya*, by which
“ *Egypt* was furnished with Horses, and
“ furnished *Solomon* and his Friends, he
“ prepared a Fleet.” Could any Man
mistake these *Words*, except one that was
desirous or resolved to find Fault? Sir Isaac
says, that *Libya* supplied *Egypt* with Horses,
and enabled the King of *Egypt* to sell so
many to *Solomon* and his Friends. Instead
of this obvious, natural Meaning of his
Words, Mr. Warburton tells us, That Sir
Isaac was “ speaking here of the Original of
“ those civil Advantages, for which ancient
“ *Egypt* was so much celebrated,” Sir
Isaac was speaking, *Here?* *Where?* Not in
this Page, nor near it. He is *here* speak-
ing of the *Times* of *Sesostris*, of the *Con-
quests* of *Sesostris*, and of nothing else. But
because Sir Isaac had in other Places, upon
other Occasions, or in Mr. Warburton’s own
Words, “ BEFORE and AFTERWARDS told
“ us his Thoughts of their [the *Egyptian*]
“ Astronomy, Navigation, Letters, Names
“ and Weapons of War, We cannot
“ THEREFORE

" THEREFORE avoid understanding what
" he HERE says of the *Libyan Horses*, to
" mean, that the Conquest of that Country
" was the *first Occasion* of *Egypt's* abound-
" ing with Horses." p. 262. i. e. Because
Sir *Isaac* has BEFORE and AFTERWARDS told
us his Thoughts of the Origin of several
Things in *Egypt*: THEREFORE HERE he
has told us his Thoughts of the Origin of
the *Abundance of Horses*. But why " can-
" not He avoid understanding" a Passage in
a Sense, which He says *contradicts the*
Scripture, when Sir *Isaac* is in Fact speak-
ing of a particular Circumstance of Time,
which enabled the *Egyptians* in a remarka-
ble Manner to supply their Neighbours with
a particular Commodity?

Sir *Isaac Newton* was perhaps one of the
most accurate and exact Writers that ever
was; clear, expressive, and so careful in
the Choice of his Words, that scarce can
you alter a Term, without hurting his
Meaning. He is speaking of a *particular*
Time, when *Egypt* was enabled to supply
Solomon and his Friends with a great Num-
ber of Horses. Mr. *Warburton* understands
this to mean, that, in Sir *Isaac's* Intention,

" This

“ This was the FIRST Occasion of Egypt’s “ abounding in Horse.” He is so just as to own, that in another Place, and when Sir Isaac was speaking on another Subject, and not of the Empire of Egypt, He confesses, “ that Egypt abounded with Horses “ earlier than the Time he here assigns.” Why then does Mr. Warburton here declare, that he “ cannot avoid understanding” Sir Isaac, in a Sense contrary to his avowed and express Words in another Place, at the Expence of a Self-Contradiction in a Man so accurate as Sir Isaac was? Especially too, when he saw, that such a Meaning was a direct Contradiction to Scripture? But had Mr. Warburton not put such a Meaning upon these Words of Sir Isaac, as is contrary to his own express Words, and to the Scriptures too, he could not have pretended that Sir Isaac espoused the Consequence, which here he charges him with.

At what Time Egypt began to abound with Horses, Sir Isaac no where says. He observes indeed, that “ in the Days of Saul “ the Philistines brought into the Field “ against him thirty thousand Chariots, and “ six thousand Horse; and that the Canaanites
“ had

"had their Horses from Egypt." This was several Years before the Times of *Sesostris*, and consequently it was not owing to the Conquest of *Libya*, that *Egypt* at that Time abounded with Horses. *Egypt* was greatly now improved, and much abounded in Horse, and was in a very different Condition from what it was at the *Exodus* of the Children of *Israel*. For "in the Days of Moses all the Chariots of Egypt, with which Pharaoh pursued Israel, were but six hundred." This was Sir Isaac's Way of Reasoning, in his Chronology, p. 167, allowing *Egypt* very much to abound in Horse, and to have supplied the *Canaanites* with them long before the Conquest of *Libya*.

But this Notion of *Egypt*'s having but six hundred Chariots at the Time of the *Israelites* going out from thence, does not favour the Opulence, Strength and high Antiquity of that Empire, which Mr. Warburton contends for; and therefore he thus opposes it. "The Pursuit of the *Israelites* is thus described. And Pharaoh made ready his Chariot, and took his People with him. And he took Six Hundred chosen Chariots, and all the Chariots of Egypt,

" Egypt, and Captains over every one of
 " them.---The Egyptians pursued after them,
 " all the Horses and Chariots of Pharaoh,
 " and his Horsemen, and his Army. --- And
 " the Egyptians pursued, and went in after
 " them to the midst of the Sea, even all
 " Pharaoh's Horses, his Chariots, and his
 " Horsemen: Exod. xiv. 6-23. Sir Isaac
 " seemed to be aware of this Evidence
 " against him, and endeavours to turn it
 " on the Side of his Hypothesis. In the
 " Days of Moses, says he, ALL the Chariots
 " of Egypt, with which Pharaoh pursued
 " Israel, were but Six Hundred." p. 262.
 Upon this Mr. Warburton cries out,---
 " This is a strange Mistake. The Six
 " Hundred, mentioned in the Place quoted,
 " are expressly said to be the chosen Chariots,
 " that is, the King's Guard, or a standing
 " Militia; for that over and above these,
 " all the Chariots of Egypt, an indefinite
 " Number, went on the Pursuit." *ibid.* I
 must observe,

1. That Sir Isaac makes the Remark,
 that the Chariots of Egypt were but Six
 Hundred in the Days of Moses; He makes,
 I say,

I say, this Remark, when he was speaking of the great Numbers of Horses which the *Philistines* had, probably from *Egypt*, in the Days of *Saul*. Fifty Pages afterwards he mentions *Sesostris*, and his Conquest of *Libya*, and there observes, that *That* gave Occasion to furnish *Solomon* with Horses; Mr. *Warburton* says, that in Consequence of this last Observation Sir *Isaac* espouses, that the Conquest of *Libya* was "the FIRST
" Occasion of *Egypt*'s abounding with Horses." A Thought! which never seems to have enter'd into Sir *Isaac*'s Head or Heart! Mr. *Warburton* then upon citing the Passage of Scripture about *Pharaoh*'s Pursuit of the *Israelites*, says, "Sir *Isaac*
" seems to have been aware of this Evidence
" against him." Evidence against him, in what? Why, that the Conquest of *Libya* furnished *Egypt* with Horses, by which Means *Egypt* furnished *Solomon*. What Evidence against him is this Affair of *Pharaoh*? For admitting *Egypt* to breed Horses in ever so great a Plenty, the Addition of *Libyan* Horses might be the Occasion of selling more, than otherwise they could or would have done.

2. "Sir Isaac seems to have been aware
" of this *Evidence against him*, and en-
" deavours to turn it on the Side of his
" *Hypothesis.*" Mr. Warburton supposes Sir
Isaac to have an "*Hypothesis,*" that the
Conquest of *Libya* was the *first Occasion* of
Egypt's abounding with Horse. Whereas,
neither in the Place here refer'd to, which
is *Chronol.* p. 167. where Sir Isaac is speak-
ing of the *Shepherd's* being drove out of the
greatest Part of their Dominions in *Egypt*
by *Misphragmuthosis*; nor in the other
Place, where He is speaking of *Sesostris's*
Conquest of *Libya*, has Sir Isaac one Word,
or one Hint at the *FIRST OCCASION* of *Egypt's*
abounding with Horses.

3. Sir Isaac, when he occasionally men-
tions the Six Hundred Chariots of *Egypt*, is
speaking of the vast Quantity of Chariots
and Horsemen, which the *Philistines* brought
into the Field against *Saul*. There were
thirty thousand Chariots, and six thousand
Horse, and People, as the Sand which is on
the Sea Shore for Multitude. 1 Sam. xiii. 5.
Whence came this vast Body of Men, Hor-
ses, and Chariots? This, Sir Isaac with his
usual Sagacity and Modesty accounts for
thus.

thus. "I seem to gather from the great Army of the *Philistines* against *Saul*, and the great Number of their Horses, that the *Shepherds* had newly relinquished *Egypt*, and join'd them." *Newt. Chro.* p. 167. This Solution seems natural, and is one Instance of ten thousand of that great Man's Sagacious Spirit. But what has Sir Isaac's *Hypothesis*, which relates wholly, whatever it is, to the Solution of this Phænomenon of such an immense *Army* at *that Time* and *Place*.---What I say has this Hypothesis to do with the FIRST Occasion of *Egypt*'s abounding with Horse?

But be Sir Isaac's Hypothesis what you please: He says (no Matter on what Occasion) that in the Days of Moses all the Chariots of Egypt, with which Pharaoh pursued Israel, were but Six Hundred. Mr. Warburton lays hold of this, and cries out, *Strange Mistake!* How so? "The six hundred mentioned in the Place quoted are expressly said to be chosen Chariots, that is, the King's Guard, or a standing Militia: For that over and above these, ALL the Chariots of Egypt, an indefinite Number, went on the Pursuit."

That

That Sir *Isaac* affirms, that the Pursuit was made with *but Six Hundred Chariots*, is true. And that this was the whole of their Strength is pretty clear; for if you take the Words in any other Construction than that which Sir *Isaac* took them in, it will hardly be possible to make common Sense of the Passage. *He took six hundred chosen Chariots, and all the Chariots of Egypt.* Are not the *Six Hundred Chariots* contained in that comprehensive Word, *ALL* the Chariots of *Egypt*? You know, Sir, that the *Hebrew Van*, and so is the *Greek Κώνις*, commonly translated *Even*; and then the Words are easy.—*He took Six Hundred Chariots, Even all the Chariots of Egypt.* This makes good Sense, and admits of nothing harsh, or uncouth, or improbable. But to talk of *Six Hundred Chariots*, and *All the Chariots of Egypt*, “an indefinite Number,” is at best, either very odd Language, or inconsistent with the History. For if *all the Chariots of Egypt*, signifies, All of the *Egyptians*, All that any *Egyptian* had, besides those of *Pharaoh*, where was the Time to get these together? Or if *Pharaoh* pursued with such an Army, as *Josephus* says he did,

Y would

would three or four Days be sufficient to get together such an immense Force, as 700 Chariots, 50,000 Horse, and 200,000 Foot? No Wonder therefore that Sir Isaac interpreted the Words, as they may very properly, and indeed ought to be interpreted.

You will tell me perhaps, that the "Six Hundred Chariots are expressly said to be *chosen* Chariots, that is, the *King's Guard*." This seems to me a New Discovery. The Kings of *Egypt* had many Horsemen, and many Foot; and *Egypt* once was famous for its numerous *Armies*, and for its *Chariots* that marched out of *Thebes*. But that these were the *King's Guard*, or used as such, I own I remember no such Custom. In Truth, by *chosen Chariots*, he means no more than, stout, good, fit for the Purpose, fit for Service; and has no Relation to such as were eminently *picked out* from an indefinite Number, but contained *all* that were fit to be employed.

Should you now ask me, how it could happen, that the King of *Egypt* could get *all the Chariots of Egypt together*, at so small

small a Warning; to pursue the *Israelites*? I must answer, that supposing the Soldiery were, in those early Days, all placed together in the *Lower Egypt*, and lived at a public Expence in a particular Spot of Land; such a small Number might be drawn together at small Notice, tho' a mighty Army could not. And if the Customs of later Times, which *Herodotus* describes, were the same as their very antient Customs were, (*a*) *a Thousand CALASIRII, and as many HERMOTIBII*; annually guarded the King: And these were (*b*) *Sword-bearers, μάχαιροφόροι*. But Chariots were never the King's Guard.

The second Consequence then, which Mr. *Warburton* tells us, that Sir *Isaac espouses*, is imaginary and groundless, and so far from being admitted or espoused by him, that he says not a Word about it.

The *Third* Consequence said to be *espoused* by Sir *Isaac*, is founded upon much the same Basis, upon mere Imagination: Only Mr. *Warburton* expresses himself with

(*a*) Καλασιρίων χίλιοι, καὶ Ἐρμοτυβίων ἀλλότε ἐδορυφέα ἔσον ἐνταῦθον ἔκαστον τὸν βασιλέα. *Herod.* l. 2. c. 168.

(*b*) V. *Herod.* l. 9. c. 31.

somewhat more Caution. His Words are,
 --- "In Consequence of the same System,
 " our great Author SEEKS to think, that
 " *Animal Food* was not in Use among the
 " Egyptians till *about* this Time." p. 270.
 He means till about *Sesostris's* Time.

What now has Sir *Isaac* really said, that may lead Mr. *Warburton* to draw such a *Consequence*? Sir *Isaac's* Words are these,---
 " The *Egyptians originally* lived on the
 " Fruits of the Earth; and fared hardly,
 " and abstained from *ANIMALS*, and
 " THEREFORE abominated Shepherds: *Me-*
 " *nès* [the third from *Sesostris*] taught them
 " to adorn their Beds and Tables with rich
 " Furniture and Carpets, and brought in
 " among them a sumptuous, delicious, and
 " voluptuous Way of Life; and about
 " a hundred Years after his Death, *Gne-*
 " *phactus*, one of his Successors, cursed him
 " for it, and to reduce the Luxury of *Egypt*,
 " caused the Curse to be enter'd in the
 " Temple of *Jupiter* at *Thebes*." Chron.
 p. 241-2.

It is certain, that Sir *Isaac* never says directly or indirectly, how long this *Original* hard Way of living lasted; nor does he say,
 that

that *Animal Food* began about Sesostris's Time: But his Design was to relate a Circumstance of the Introduction of *Luxury*, which consisted in *rich Furniture*, and a *sumptuous, delicious and voluptuous Way of Life*. A natural Consequence of an extended Empire raised by Sesostris, and of great Power and Riches then flowing into Egypt.

But let us suppose, that Sir Isaac did *espouse* this Consequence (which in Truth he has said nothing about) Mr. Warburton's Attempt to confute him is very far from being satisfactory. He attempts to prove, that the *Egyptians* were *Flesh Eaters*, before the Days of *Joseph*. The Reason assigned by Sir Isaac, why the *Egyptians* abstained from *Animal Food* was, that *Shepherds* were an *Abomination* to them, because they eat it. How long this Abomination lasted is nowhere said. If it continued till the Days of *Misphragmuthosis*, who made a long War on the *Shepherds*, and cleared the Land of *Egypt* of most of them, and shut up the rest in *Abaris*, or *Pelusium*; or if it continued some Years longer, till they were totally expelled by *Tethmosis*: Then the *Egyptians*

did not eat Flesh till the Days of *Saul* or *David*. Not that Flesh was not eat in *Egypt* till these Times ; for the *Shepherds*, who had conquered the *Lower Egypt*, and reigned over it for many Years, eat *Animal Food* ; tho' the *original, natural Egyptians* did not. The *Shepherds* reigned over the *Lower Egypt*, if *Manetho* in *Josephus* be right, *five hundred and eleven Years*. But this Period is certainly much too long : For when he reckons up their Kings, and the Years of their Reigns, they scarce make up (c) 260 Years. *Saltis* reigned 19 Years, *Bæon* 44. *Apachnas* 36 Years and seven Months. *Apochis* 61, *Janias* 50 Years and one Month. *Affis* 49 Years, and two Months. And if you suppose the *Shepherds* to have reigned five hundred and eleven Years, as *Manetho*'s Numbers are, and to have been expelled by *Thumosis* or *Tethmosis*, as Sir *Isaac* has fixed it, 1070 Years before *Christ*, add 511 Years to that, and the

(c) *Saltis* 19 Years.

Bæon 44

Apachnas 36 Years, and seven Months.

Apochis 61

Janias 50 Years, and one Month.

Affis 49 Years, and two Months.

259 Years, and ten Months.

Shepherds

Shepherds came into *Egypt* some time about the Birth of *Moses*. Now this could not be, because the *Israelites* were then in Possession of the Land of *Goshen*, and no mention is made of any Conquests or Disturbances in those Parts before the *Exodus*; and yet the *Shepherds*, when they invaded *Egypt*, built and fortified *Abaris*, and must have passed through *Goshen*, in order to conquer *Egypt*. Nor were the *Shepherds* Lords of *Egypt* in *Joseph's* Time, as appears from the *Abomination*, which the *Egyptians* had to eat Bread with the *Hebrews*. Gen. xlivi. 32. They must therefore conquer *Egypt* long after this; and therefore *Manetho's* Numbers must be corrected, so as to suit with Truth. The Kings, which he names, reigned 260 Years. Add to these about 150 Years, for the Time which is to be divided amongst those whom *Josephus* calls τὰς ἐξ αὐλῶν γενομένας, the *Descendents of the Pastor Kings*, and for the long War, πολυχείριον, upon the *Shepherds*, during *Misiphragmuthofis's* Reign, and *Amosis's*, and we shall fix the Conquest of *Egypt* after *Moses* had brought the Children of *Israel* from thence, when *Egypt* was depopulated, its

Armies lost, and itself uncapable of making Resistance. If the *Shepherds* were the *Canaanites*, and *Arabian Shepherds* flying from *Joshua*, there will not be above 100 Years, or little more, to be so divided.

It may perhaps be imagined, that the Aversion, which the genuine *Egyptians* had to the *Shepherds*, arose from the *Invasion* and Conquest, which the *Shepherds* had made over all the Lower *Egypt*. And since we find the Aversion so early as *Joseph's Days*, it may seem probable, that the *Shepherds* had overrun *Egypt* before those Days; and so Chronologers usually fix this Period of antient Times. But

If this were true, then it is plain, that this Period of the *Shepherds* reign in *Egypt* was over before the Time of the *Exodus* of the Children of *Israel*: For That *Pharaoh*, who-reigned in *Moses's Time*, was certainly a genuine *Egyptian*; as appears from *Moses's* telling him, that they were to sacrifice the *Abomination* of the *Egyptians* to the Lord. Had this *Pharaoh* been a *Shepherd*, *Moses* could not have made this Speech, because the Religion of the *Egyptians* was so contrary to that of the *Shepherds*, that when they

they invaded *Egypt*, we find, they *destroyed their Temples*, even to the Foundations; *τὰ ἵδη τῶν θεῶν κατέραψαν.* *Josephus*, l. i. c. *Apion*. To sacrifice therefore the Abomination of the *Egyptians* would have been no Difficulty, or Objection to *Pharaoh*, or any Reason why they should not carry away their Cattle with them, had *Pharaoh* been a *Shepherd King*.

Let us then go back to the Time of *Joseph*, and we find, that when he entertained his Brethren, That King likewise could not be a *Shepherd*. The Attendants on *Joseph* were *Egyptians*; and the Speech he put into his Brethrens Mouths was,--- *that thy Servants Trade hath been about Cattle from our Youth, even until now,*--- and then it is added, --- *For every Shepherd is an Abomination to the Egyptians.* Gen. xlvi. 34. Some Time before this, when his Brethren came down to *Egypt*, and he entertained them, *the Egyptians eat by themselves, because the Egyptians might not eat Bread with the Hebrews, for that is an Abomination unto the Egyptians.* c. xliii. 32. At this Time therefore the genuine *Egyptians* were in Power, and *Pharaoh* was an *Egyptian*,

tian, not a *Shepherd*. The Dynasty therefore of the *Egyptians* was either not yet begun; or else it was quite over, and the genuine *Egyptians* got into Power again by the Expulsion of the *Shepherds*.

The first Remark from these Considerations is, that *Josephus*, and all those who follow him in the Notion, that the *Israelites* were the *Pastors* that reigned in *Egypt*, are quite mistaken. The *Israelites* that enter'd *Egypt* were *Friends*; the *Shepherds* came to conquer it: The *Israelites* never attempted to reign; the *Shepherds* had several Kings: The one came down thither few in Number, the other in immense Bodies.

2. If you make the Descent of the *Shepherds* to be before the Days of *Joseph*, and their Reign over *Egypt* to have lasted any Term of Years; suppose 500, as *Manetho* says, or thereabouts, and that the *Pastors* were expelled *Egypt* by *Amosis*, at or about the Time when the *Argive Æra* began in *Inachus*, this will bring the Reign of the *Pastors* in *Egypt* within twenty Years of the Flood. Archbishop *Usher* fixes *Tethmosis* to the Year of the World 2179, deduct from hence 511 Years that the *Shepherds* reign'd
in

in *Egypt*, and you come within eleven Years of the Flood: And was *Egypt* thus early inhabited? and had built Temples so soon? and was so soon conquered by the Shepherds?

3. The State of the World, and of Kings in these early Days, makes it impossible that the Shepherds should invade *Egypt* at any time before the *Exodus* of the Children of *Israel* from thence. Genuine *Egyptians* all reigned in *Egypt* till that time, as I have observed; nor could such an Invasion have happened before those Days consistent with the Scriptures, because we have such sure Marks to direct us.

Besides, the first King of these Shepherds *Salatis*, built *Abaris*, and fortified it with Walls, and put a Garrison of 240,000 Men in it; a Force too great for those times, when all the Kings of all those Parts, as far as appears, were no more than Governors of single Towns, and capable of raising but small Force. This is evident from there being *five Kings* on no more Territory than what is contained in the *Salt Sea*, i.e. about Seventy Miles in length and Twenty in breadth. And *Abraham* beat the four Kings which

which had conquered those five Kings with
an Army of no more than 318 Men.

The Aversion then to the Shepherds did not arise from the *Invasion and Conquests* made by the *Shepherds* over the *Egyptians*: Nor does it seem to have arisen from the difference of *Religion* in those early times. *Abraham* was civilly treated by the King of *Egypt* in his time: and though abounding in Cattle does not seem to have been misused, or contemned or reproached on that account. We know nothing of the Religion of *Egypt* or of the Neighbour Nations in those times; but only that *Abraham* and the Patriarchs offered Sacrifices, and made Leagues with People, and eat Flesh together as Friends.

Now the genuine Original *Egyptians* were not *Flesh eaters*. And the Evidence for this is --- every *Shepherd* is an Abomination to the *Egyptians*. Gen. xlvi. 34. This Aversion still continued in *Moses's Days*: for he tells *Pharoah*, (who was no *Shepherd*, as appears from *Moses's Speech*, and consequently the *Shepherds* were not then in Possession of *Egypt*) that they could not sacrifice to God in *Egypt*, for we shall sacrifice the Abomination of the *Egyptians* to the Lord our God.

Lo!

Lo ! shall we sacrifice the Abomination of the Egyptians before their Eyes, and will they not stone us ? Exod. viii. 26. They were to sacrifice to God Lambs and Bullocks, and Goats, and they usually eat of the Sacrifices which they offer'd. Had the meaning of *Moses* been, that we shall sacrifice *Cows* which are consecrated to *Iris*, and which the *Egyptians* did not sacrifice ; or *Sheep* which are not sacrificed in some Provinces, --- he would not have called these the *Abomination* of the *Egyptians*, but the reverse, what they deemed so *baly*, as that they were not to be sacrificed. If the meaning be this, --- that which the *Egyptians* abhor to see killed, --- This is a Language that is not to be matched, to call that an *Abomination*, which is so esteem'd as to make Men abominate those who hurt it. Whereas the natural and plain Sense is, that we are to sacrifice and to eat that which the *Egyptians* abhor ; we are to sacrifice to God *Flesh*, and to eat of that *Flesh* ; a thing which the *Egyptians* abominate. If you say that the *Abomination of the Egyptians*, is the same as the *Abomination of the Nations*, i. e. not what the *Egyptians* abominated, more than what the Nations
abominated,

abominated, but what each of them practised and liked, though abominated by God, — this Construction will not do in the present Case. For God *approved* what was offered to him, both as to the matter and manner; which was not the case where the Scriptures speak of the Abominations of the *Gentiles*.

That the *Egyptians* were sustained at first by Roots and Herbs, is expressly told us by *Diodorus*: (*a*) that afterwards they eat Fish, and Flesh too, is said by the same Writer: But how long they continued in their *hard original* way of Life, does not appear. When the *Shepherds* conquered *Egypt* they might introduce the Custom of eating Animal Food. And if the Original *Egyptians* learnt from them, it is very consistent with all that Sir *Isaac* has said: Or if they continued their Aversion till the Expulsion of them, nothing is produced by Mr. *Warburton* to refute it. e. gr.

He first tells us, that “from the Dream of *Pharaoh's Baker* compared with Jo-

(*a*) Βίω τὸ παλαιὸν Αἰγυπτίους φασὶ χρῆσαι τὸ μὲν ἀρχαῖοταλον πόσαν ἐδίοιτες, καὶ τὰν εν τοῖς ἔλεσι γειτομένων τὸς καυλὸς καὶ τὰς ρίζας — Δευτέρην δὲ λέγεσιν ἔχειν διαγώγην τὸς Αἰγυπτίους τὴν τῶν ἰχθύων βρῶσιν — ὅμοίως δὲ τῷκ βοσκημάτου ἔνια σφεκοφαγεῖν — Diod. Sic. p. 40. 41.

" *Seph's Interpretation*, it appears that they
" eat *Animal Food.*" p. 271. In the Dream
it seems, in the uppermost Basket there was
all manner of **BAK'D MEATS** for *Pharaoh*,
and the Birds did eat out of the Basket.
In the Interpretation, it is, *Pharaoh shall
hang thee on a Tree, and the Birds shall EAT
thy Flesh from off thee. Gen. xl. 17. &c.* Now
is not this an excellent Proof that the *Egyptians*
did eat Flesh, because in the Interpretation
it is said---the Birds shall eat *thy* Flesh?
If this proves any thing, it would prove the
Egyptians to be *Anthropophagi*, errant *Man-Eaters*.

Perhaps Mr. *Warburton* may lay his Stress
upon the Word, **BAKEMEATS**, since he has
printed it in Capitals. He certainly has in-
fer'd from the *English* Word, that the Baker
prepared *Flesh* for the King: whereas in the
Original no more is meant, than what was
prepared by the Baker in those Days, what-
ever it was.

So again, he refers to the " murmuring
" of the *Israelites* in the Wilderness of *Sin*,
" when they said, wou'd to God we had
" died by the Hand of the Lord in the
" Land of *Egypt*, when we sat by the
FLESH-

" FLESH POTS, and when we did eat Bread
" to the full. Now we can never suppose
" the *Egyptians* would suffer their Slaves,
" whom they kept in so hard Oppression, to
" riot in *Fleshpots*, if it was as Sir Isaac sup-
" poses, that *Animal Food* was an *Abomina-*
" *tion* to them." p. 272. i. e. Because the
Israelites who were *Shepherds*, and did eat
Flesh in *Egypt*, long'd to be in the Land of
Goshen again, where they did eat *Flesh* and
Bread to the full: therefore the *Egyptians*,
a different People from the *Israelites*, and who
hated *Shepherds*, did eat *Flesh*.

But the principal Argument is taken from
the Description of *Joseph's Entertainment* of
his Brethren, by which " it appears that a
" difference of Diet with regard to such
" Food, was not the occasion of the *Egypt-*
" *tian Enmity* to Shepherds. The common
" Provision for the Entertainment was *Ani-*
" *mal Food*; and no one can doubt whe-
" ther *Joseph* conformed to the *Egyptian*
" Diet. He sat single out of State, with
" regard to the *Egyptians*: The *Egyptians*
" sat apart with regard to the Shepherds;
" and both were supplied from the Gover-
" nors

nor's Table, which was furnished from the Stewards *Slaughter-House*: p. 272.

The plain Fact was this: *Shepherds* were to be entertained; for which Reason *Joseph* bids the Ruler of his House, not barely to *make ready*, but *SLAY, and make ready*. The *Egyptians* sat apart by themselves, BECAUSE the *Egyptians* *might not eat Bread with the Hebrews*, *for that is an Abomination to the Egyptians*: Gen. xlivi. 32. Now what is it that created that Abomination to the *Hebrews*, that the *Egyptians* would not eat with them, except the Difference of Diet? The polite *Egyptians* could not abominate the Stranger *Hebrew*, so as not to sit at the same Table with him, were it not from a perfect Dislike and Abhorrence of his Food. For I do not think, that so early as these Times, Superstition had prevailed so far, as it certainly did afterwards, to make them afraid (*b*) to *use the Spit, or Pot, or Knife of a Grecian, or taste the Flesh of a Bullock that was cut with a Grecian Knife*.

Two therefore of the Consequences, which Mr. Warburton charges Sir Isaac with "ef-

(*b*) Οὐδὲ μαχαιρὶ ἀνθεῖς Ἐλληνος χρῆσται, οὐδὲ ὄβελοῖσι, οὐδὲ λέβητι, οὐδὲ κρέως καθαρῷ βοὸς διατετμημένῳ Ἐλληνικῇ μαχαιρὶ γεῦσται. Herod. l. 2. c. 41.

"posing," he never did espouse. This *Third*, he is charged with only SEEMING to espouse; and for any thing which Mr. Warburton has said to the contrary, he might have openly avowed it; and let it have rested on the Authorities above cited. Let me now proceed to,

The *Fourth Consequence* charged upon Sir Isaac. It is this, as it lies in p. 258, That "the exact Distribution of Property in Egypt was the PRODUCT of the Age of Sesostris." Fourteen Pages after, when the Consequence, which Sir Isaac is said to have espoused, was to be refuted, Mr. Warburton states his Point thus, --- "He [Sir Isaac] supposes, that the exact Division of the Land of Egypt into Property was FIRST made in the Time of Sesostris."

p. 272. Surely I need not observe, that these are Two very different Propositions; and Sir Isaac might maintain the first, and yet deny the second, with great Consistency. But in Truth Sir Isaac espouses neither of them. It is strange, that Mr. Warburton should charge a Man of Sir Isaac's known Accuracy, with Consequences as admitted and maintained, and yet not keep to his

Words,

Words, or attend to his Reasoning. The Evidence, which Mr. Warburton brings to justify his Charge, is this,--- “*Sesostris upon his returning home divided Egypt by Measure amongst the Egyptians; and this gave a Beginning to Surveying and Geometry.*” Does Sir Isaac say, that Sesostris was the First that divided the Land of Egypt into *Property*? That He *divided the Land by Measure*, and had a particular Reason for so doing, is indeed said; but that He was the FIRST that did so, is no where said, nor espoused. Sir Isaac produces his Voucher, *Herodotus*, for what he says; and *Herodotus* affixes this Reason for what Sesostris did, (c) *That a certain Tax being to be paid from each Man, if the River washed away his Land, it should be measured, and a proportionable Deduction be made;* and then he adds, that thence Geometry was, in his Opinion, found out. What signifies what Joseph did 500 or 600 Years before? Egypt had suffer'd two or three great Revolutions betwixt Jo-

(c) Εἰ δὲ τίνος τὰ κλῆρα ὁ πόλιος τι παρελθεῖ, ἐλθῶν ἀπὸ τῆς ἀστοῦ, ἐπίμετρο τὸ γεγενημένον. Οὐδὲ ἔτειπε τὴς ἐπιστρατηγίας, καὶ ἀναμητρίσαντες ὅσῳ ἐπέσαν διχῶντος γέγονε, σκωτά τὰ λοιπά καὶ λόγου τῆς τεταρτήνες αὐτοροήπις τελέοι. Δεκάτη δὲ μετὰ ἐνθεύτεν Γένερεστιν οὐρανοῖς. Herod. l. i. c. 109.

Seph's and *Sesostris's* Days. The *Shepherds* had conquer'd it, and they had been expelled again. The very *Exodus* of the Children of *Israel*, and the Consequence of that, the Loss of *Pharaoh's* Army, must occasion great Alterations of Property in the Land. *Sesostris* therefore might *measure* out, or divide the Land, into private Property, notwithstanding what *Joseph* had done before. Or he might have much *more* to divide, as being King of *all Egypt*, than that King in *Joseph's* Days might have. Or he might divide it in other *Proportions*; and in another *Manner*. Here therefore Mr. *Warburton* makes Sir *Isaac* *espouse*, what he never did admit, *viz.* That *Sesostris* was the FIRST that divided the Land of *Egypt* into private Property; and then truly confutes him by the Instance of *Joseph*.

But Sir *Isaac* has added a Remark from *Herodotus*, that "this gave a Beginning to "Surveying and *Geometry*." And here he is guilty of a manifest Contradiction; for "in another Place He draws down the Ori- "ginal of *Geometry* still lower. *Mæris*, "says he, for preserving the Division of "Egypt into equal Shares amongst the Sol- "diers, wrote a *Book of Surveying*, which "gave a Beginning to *Geometry*. Let the
"Reader

“ Reader now consider, how possible it is to re-
 “ concile this with the following Account of
 “ Joseph’s Administration.” p. 272.

There is no Occasion to reconcile what Sir Isaac has said with the Scriptural Account of Joseph’s Administration. Had Sir Isaac intimated or espoused the Notion that *Sesostris* was the FIRST that divided any of the Land of *Egypt* amongst the People, it might have seemed impossible to reconcile that, to what Joseph did so long before. But this is a mere Invention of Mr. Warburton, who has imputed to Sir Isaac what he has never said. And as to the Beginning of *Geometry*, if by the One, no more was meant than properly Surveying and Measuring Land, and in the other Place, *Geometry*, in its fuller Extent, occasioned first by a Book of Surveying, there is an End of this seeming Difference.

What Sir Isaac has here said, has been observed by others. Clavius observed, (a)

Z 3 “ that

(a) Cum Anniversaria *Nili* inundatio agrorum terminos ac limites ita confunderet vastaretque, ut nemo agrum dignoscere posset suum, cœperunt *Ægyptii* animos ad rationem mensurandorum agrorum applicare, ut hoc modo cœlibet quod suum erat redderetur. Quæ quidem ratio agros metiandi, quanquam tunc temporis, adhuc rūdis admodum fuerit

" that the anniversary Inundation of the
 " Nile so confounded the Bounds of the
 " Fields, that no Man could *know* with
 " Certainty his own Land: This made the
 " *Egyptians* apply themselves to a Method
 " of measuring Land; that by this Means
 " each Man might have and enjoy his own.
 " That this Method of measuring Fields,
 " tho' at that Time very rough, and not
 " exact, was called *Geometry*. ---- That
 " by Degrees *Geometry* began to be *more*
 " *compleat*, and not content within its own
 " Bounds, was applied to the Measurement
 " of *Cælestia Bodies*, and deliver'd the
 " Principles of *Astronomy*, *Perspective*, *Co-*
 " *mography*, &c." Will not this fully ac-
 count for the Use of the Word *Geometry*,
 in a more strict and proper, and in a more
 large and comprehensive Sense?

But says Mr. Warburton, " how does it
 " appear from this simple Fact of *Sesostris*,
 " dividing the large Champain Country of

rit-ac impolita, ab ipso tamen officio Geometria est appellata.
 Τεωμελέωμεν enim, sive γεωμετρέω, idem significat quod
 terram metior. Cæterum paulatim deinde Geometria crepta
 est expoliri, & non contenta suis finibus, sepe ad corpora etiam
 cœlestia dimetienda convertit tradiditque præcepta universæ
 Astronomiæ, Perspectivæ, Cosmographiæ & alijs disciplinis
 quam plurimis, quæ ex ipsa velut radice dependent. *Clavium*
 in Eud. Prolegem.

“ Egypt into Square Fields, by cross-cut
 “ Canals, that it was a dividing Egypt by
 “ Measure, and giving a Beginning to Sur-
 “ veying and Geometry. If we examine
 “ the Cause and Effect of that Atchieve-
 “ ment, we shall find, that neither the
 “ one, nor the other Part of the Conclusion,
 “ can be deduced from it. The *Cause* of
 “ making these Canals was *evidently to*
 “ *drain* the swampy Marshes of this vast
 “ extended Level, and to render the whole
 “ Labourable.” p. 274.

You have here a strong Assertion of Mr. Warburton's, in flat Contradiction to History. Herodotus tells us not, that it was to “ drain the swampy Marshes;” but that every one had a certain Portion of Land assigned him, and if the River happened to wash away any Part of his Lot, the Man was to come and complain: Upon this, Surveyors were sent, who having measured how much the Land was lessened, the Man was to pay proportionably less of the Tax that was appointed him. Thus has Mr. Warburton mistaken the *Cause* of this “ Atchievement,” as he calls it: And as to the *Effects* of it, he says, “ Ground once divided by such

"Canals was in no Danger of a Change of
"Land Marks, and consequently had small
"Occasion for future Surveys." This like-
wise is contrary to Experience; for Land
annually overflowed for Months together,
by a turbid River, must necessarily partly
be washed away, and partly have its Bound-
aries fill'd up, and in Course there must be
Occasion for frequent Surveys. But I guess
where his Mistake lies. *Sesostris divided*
Egypt into 36 Nomes or Counties, and dug
a Canal from the Nile to the Head City of
every Nome, and with the Earth dug out of
it, he caused the Ground of the City to be
raised. This was one Act of *Sesostris*; but
not that which gave Occasion for the In-
vention of *Geometry*. Another Thing, which
Sesostris did, was to divide *Egypt* amongst
his many Soldiers and People: And every
Man was out of his respective Portion,
which was *measured* to him, to pay a cer-
tain *Tax* proportionable to his Land. Now
Herodotus tells us, that *this Division*, not
the *other Division* of the Country into *Nomes*,
was the Occasion of *Geometry*. And here
there might be frequent Occasion for Sur-
veys; whereas in the other, there might be

no great Danger of the Change of Land-Marks. So that Sir *Isaac* is here too misrepresented by Mr. *Warburton*; as well as charged with *espousing* a Consequence, which he does *not* espouse: for he never says that *Sesostris* was the *First* that divided the Land of *Egypt* into private Property.

Poss we next to the “*Fifth* Inference, “ which this great Writer makes from his “ System, *viz.* That *Letters* were unknown “ in *Egypt* till the Time of *David*.” p. 275. This is the *fifth* Consequence, which Mr. *Warburton* charges Sir *Isaac* with *espousing*, whereas it is in Fact the *First* that he espouses, or owns. And it appears to be so true, and so just an Observation, that I am contented to have it stand or fall by his Judgment, that has examined Sir *Isaac*’s Chronology with Care.

Mr. *Warburton* asserts indeed, that “ as “ to the precise Time of the Invention of “ *Egyptian Letters*, it can never be so “ much as *guessed* at: First, because *Hiero-*
“ *glyphics* continued still in Use long after
“ Letters had been found out; and Se-
“ condly, The Invention of Letters was
“ given to the Gods.” p. 138.

Mr.

Mr. Warburton had before him a *Guess* at the *precise Time*; and that founded on such Probability, that after all his Endeavours, he has not been able to disprove. The Inventor of *Letters* in *Egypt* is known to be *Thoth*, Secretary to *Osiris*, or *Sesostris*. For that they were two Persons has not yet been proved. *Thoth* therefore lived in *Sesostris's Days*; and as *Sesostris* was deified, and called *Osiris*, the Invention was in the Days of the *Gods*. Mr. Warburton too, tho' he tells us, that the precise Time of the Invention of Letters, can never be so much as guessed at, himself has "guessed at the *precise Time*," when Letters were invented in *Egypt*, how wrongly soever he has guessed, *viz.* when he seems to fix the Times of *Osiris*, according to the "extra-vagant Chronology of *Egypt*." p. 222. *i.e.* about 300 Years before *Adam* died, or A. P. J. 1392.

The last Inference, which Mr. Warburton pretends to be contrary to Sacred Antiquity is, "That *Egypt* was so thinly peopled before the Birth of *Moses*, that *Pharaoh* said of the *Israelites*, Behold the People of the Children of *Israel* are more and mightier than

"than we."---And to prevent their multiplying, and growing too strong, he caused their Male Children to be drowned. p. 276.

You must give me leave to transcribe from Sir *Isaac* what immediately preceeded this Observation, and then I leave you to judge of its Truth. He had taken Notice, that every City of the *Canaanites* had its own King; and that in the Patriarchs Time, the Fields of *Phœnicia* were not fully appropriated for Want of People. "The Countries, says he, first inhabited by Mankind, were in those Days so thinly peopled, that *Four Kings* from the Coasts of *Shinar* and *Elam* invaded and spoiled the *Rephaims*, and the Inhabitants of the Countries of *Moab*, *Ammon*, *Edom*, and the Kingdoms of *Sodom*, *Gomorrah*, *Admah* and *Zeboim*; and yet were pursued and beaten by *Abraham* with an armed Force of only 318 Men."--- And then follows the Observation about *Egypt*. Chron. p. 186.

Mr. *Warburton's* Answer to this Observation is, --- " Yet this Country so thinly peopled before, or at the Birth of *Moses*, was, as we find from Scripture, so vastly populous,

" populous, by that Time he was sent on
 " his Mission, that it could keep in Slavery,
 " fix hundred thousand Men, besides Chil-
 " dren; at a Time too, when they were
 " most powerfully instigated to recover their
 " Liberty." p. 276. As if one Master can-
 not keep in Subjection many Slaves, or one
 King many Subjects: Or as if that Coun-
 try might not be *thinly peopled* com-
 paratively, fourscore Years before it became
 populous, either by the Access of Strangers,
 or its own prolific Virtue. (*a*) *Strabo*, and
Aristotle, and *Pliny*, speak of a peculiar and
extraordinary Fœcundity in the *Egyptian*
Women; and tell us, that they bring forth
two, three, four, and more, at a Birth;
and where there is so very great, and re-
markable an Encrease, in fourscore or an
hundred Years, a Country from being
thinly peopled may with Ease grow very
populous.

But there was something particular in
this Case. Sir Isaac observed, that before
the Birth of *Moses*, *Pharaoh* said, --- *Behold
the Children of Israel are more and mightier*

(a) Τὰς δὲ γυναικας ἔσθοτε καὶ τετέλλυνα τίκτουν τὰς
 Ἀιγυπτίας. Αεισόλειπτας δέ καὶ ἐπιδιδυμά τινα ισορροφή τε-
 λοκέρας. *Strabo*. l. 15. p. 1018. al. 695.

than we.. Mr. Warburton cries out, " Amazing Interpretation ! The Scripture Relation of that Matter is in these Words,—
" And Pharaoh said unto his People, Behold
" the People of the Children of Israel are more
" and mightier than we. Come on, let us
" deal wisely with them, lest they multiply ;
" and it come to pass, that when there falleth
" out any War, they join also unto our Enemies,
" and fight against us, and so get them
" out of the Land. Therefore they set over
" them Taskmasters to afflict them with their
" Burdens.—But the more they afflicted them,
" the more they grew and multiplied. By
" the whole Turn of this Relation, it appears,
" that more and mightier signify more
" prolific and healthy."

Mr. Warburton does well to cry out with so much Astonishment, against Sir Isaac, for supposing *more* to signify *more*.—“ Amazing Interpretation.” What then does the Word *more* signify? Why, *more prolific*. And what does the Word *mightier* signify? Why, *more healthy*. Who will not cry out on such Criticism, “ Amazing Interpretation!” Ought he not to have produced one Instance at least of such Signification of

of the Words? Is it not *Pharaoh's* Design to hinder them from growing and multiplying? And was not the Foundation of the Fear, that they were already more and mightier than the *Egyptians*. However prolific the *Egyptian* Women were, yet the *Israelitish* Women seem to be more so; and if from seventy Persons, within the Compass of two hundred and fourteen or fifteen Years, could arise *two Millions and a half*, or near *three Millions* of People; we are to deduct fourscore Years for the Age of *Moses*; and some little Time more between this formed Design of *Pharaoh*, and *Moses's* Birth, and thence deduct a proportionable Number, in order to know the Numbers of the *Israelites* at that Time. If so many more were born among them, than there was among the *Egyptians*, *Pharaoh* might have Reason to apprehend a Revolt or a Rebellion from them, if a proper Occasion offer'd; and might have just Reason to say, that they were, or soon would be, *more and mightier* than his own Subjects.

You have the very same Expression, Gen. xxvi. 16. *Abimelech* said unto *Isaac*, Go from us, for thou art mightier than we. Did he

he mean thou art more *prolifit*, or more *healthy*? Or do not the Words intimate, that *Isaac* was more *strong* than *Abimelech*, from the Numbers of his Descendants? This, like that in *Egypt*, arose from God's peculiar Blessing on *Abraham*'s Posterity, which was the very Cause of that Might, which *Abimelech* then, and *Pharaoh* afterwards, was so much afraid of.

Six Inferences then are produced, as *espoused* by Sir *Isaac*, all "contrary to Sacred "Antiquity." Four of them are Mr. *Warburton*'s own Imaginations, never *espoused*, never admitted, never mentioned by the Knight. The other Two are *espoused*: the One is agreeable to History, the Other is what the Bible itself says.

Not content with the Charge I have been considering, Mr. *Warburton* adds, that this System of the *Great Genius* whom he has *complimented* so much, is "repugnant to it-self," and "directly contradicting the "Nature of Things." Unhappy Sir *Isaac*! "The Sublime Conceptions peculiar to thy "amazing Genius" are now found to be "not only repugnant to the Bible, but even "to themselves!" p. 277. "Worthy only
"the

" the wild Imagination of those Poetic Fa-
bulists from whence they were collected !"

p. 280.

This Repugnancy to the *Nature of Things* consists in this ; that Sir Isaac " makes this extraordinary Age of *Sesostris* to be distinguished from all others by an inseparable Mixture of Savage and Polished Manners, which is so unnatural, so incredible, so impossible a Circumstance, that were there only this to oppose against his System, it would be a sufficient *Demonstration* of its Falshood." p. 278.

The Charge you see is home ; but how is it proved ? Why truly, " by fairly and honestly taking in THESE Consequences of his System, our great Author has subjected it to this Disgrace." *ibid.* Has Sir Isaac ever " taken in" Four of these Consequences ? Or is it fair and honest in Mr. Warburton to charge him with Consequences that he calls " so unnatural, so incredible, so impossible ?" Take some imaginary Consequences, incredible, impossible ; and say, that if Sir Isaac had fairly and honestly taken them in, he would have subjected his *Principia*, or his Treatise of *Light and Colours*, to the Disgrace

Disgrace of *Repugnancy to itself, and to the Nature of Things*: What then? Would this be any Objection to them? Just as much as it is to his System of Chronology; or as it might be to *Euclid* himself.

But Two Instances are produced, “ The one taken from Sir Isaac’s Account of the *State of War*, during this Period; the other from his Account of the *State of Architecture*. ” *ibid.*

You are now to *suppose*, or take for granted, that Sir Isaac has given “ an Account of the STATE of War,” during this Period; as likewise that he has given an Account of the STATE of Architecture. Who would not imagine, that Sir Isaac had some where treated of the Levies of Soldiers; of the antient Arms used in several Parts of the World during this Period; the Fortification of Camps; battering Engines, Sieges, Rewards, Manner of drawing up Armies, &c.? And so on the other Head, when Sir Isaac’s Account of the State of Architecture in this Period is spoken of, would you not imagine that he has treated upon this Subject, so far as this Period was concerned? that He

had mentioned something of *Proportions*, *Ornaments*, *Columns*, *Materials*, and many other Subjects necessary to be mentioned in giving an Account of the STATE of Architecture, during any Period? And is there any Thing in Sir Isaac's Chronology that will answer these Characters, --- his *Account of the State of War, and State of Architecture, during this Period?* No. But it seems our Author " having made the *Egyptian Hercules* to be *Sesostris*, is forced to own, " that the War in *Libya* was carried on " with *Clubs.*" Allowing this; Is this to " give an *Account of the State of War during this Period.*" If the *Africans* and *Egyptians* fought with *Clubs*, other Nations had, or might have, Cavalry, Chariots of War, and many other Things which he ought to mention, if he had designed to give an Account of the *State of War* during this Period? But as to the Fact, He quotes *Hyginus*, who says, *Afri et Egyptii primum fustibus dimicaverunt*: and He might have added the Authority of *Pliny*, whom I have before quoted for the same Fact. But Mr. *Warburton* adds, That Sir Isaac " makes " *Vulcan*

"*Vulcan*, whom he supposed to have lived
"at this Time, the *Inventor of Military
Weapons.*" p. 279. I have already shewn,
that Sir *Isaac* never made *Vulcan* the *Inven-
tor of military Weapons*; and if the Auth-
ority of *Hyginus* and *Pliny* be sufficient to
justify the Fact they are quoted for, what
is the *unnatural*, the *incredible*, the *impossible
Circumstance*, that is of itself a sufficient
Demonstration of the Falshood of Sir *Isaac*'s
System? Here are Two Nations go out, and
fight with a particular Sort of *Clubs*, after
that *Military Weapons*, *Swords*, *Spears*, &c.
were known in other Parts of the World,
and after that a Fleet was built on the Red
Sea. The best and most eminent Maker of
Armour lived in these Times, and assisted
Sesostris with *Armour*, or perhaps with *Iron*
Instruments of War, instead of what was
made of softer Metals; and was therefore
deified by Him. Where is the Inconsisten-
cy, or Incredibility, or Impossibility of this?
Sesostris first fights the *Africans* with *Clubs*;
then he invades other Countries; and re-
ceives from *Vulcan* *IronArmour*, or *Weapons*.
Is there any Absurdity in all this? Sir

Isaac ought "fairly and honestly to have 'taken in' some 'absurd Consequence,'" and then indeed Mr. *Warburton* might have triumphed.

The other Instance is still more unlucky in Relation to the STATE of Architecture. "Sir *Isaac* tells us, that *Tosorthrus*, or *Aesculapius*, an *Egyptian* of the Time of *Sesoftris*, found out building with *Square Stones.*" p. 279. He is called *Sesorthus* by *Eusebius*. Μεδ' ὁ Σέσορθος, ὁς Ἀσκλήπιος παρ' Αἰγυπτίοις ἐκλίπη διὰ τὴν ιατρικὴν. Οὗτος καὶ τὴν διὰ ζεσῶν λίθων εὑρεῖτο. ἀλλὰ καὶ γραφῆς ἐπεμελήθη. In the third Dynasty of the *Memphitic Kings* was *Necherochis*. After him *Sesorthus*, who was called *Aesculapius* by the *Egyptians* for his Skill in Surgery; He also found out the Way of building with cut Stones, and took Pains in the Art of Writing. The Confutation of this is to be sought for in these Words. "YET his Contemporary, *Sesoftris*, he tells us, divided *Egypt* into 36 Nomes or Counties, and dug a Canal from the *Nile* to the Head of every *Nome*; and with the Earth dug out of it, he caused the Ground of the City to be raised

" raised higher, and built a Temple in every City for the Worship of the *Nome*, &c. And soon after *Amenophis*, the third from him, built *Memphis*, and ordered the Worship of the Gods of *Egypt*, and built a Palace at *Abydus*, and the *Memnonia* at *This* and *Susa*, and the magnificent Temple of *Vulcan* in *Memphis*."

p. 279. I do not ask here, what Sir *Isaac* says about the *State of Architecture* during this Period, (of which he says not one Word, except the finding out *building with Square Stones* in *Egypt*) but what is Mr. *Warburton's* Contradiction to Sir *Isaac*, or what is his Proof, that That Sort of Building was found out in *Egypt* earlier? He quotes Sir *Isaac* for saying, that *Sesostris* dug certain Canals from the *Nile*: Were these Canals faced with *Square Stone*? Or if they were, *Tosertbrus* had found out the Art. What if *Amenophis* built *Memphis*, or the *Memnonia*, or the magnificent Temple of *Vulcan*? He lived long enough after the Days of *Sesostris*, and after that Manner of building with *Square Stones* was found out; for he was the *Third* from *Sesostris*.

Mr.

Mr. Warburton has added a very remarkable Note, in which he tells us "Homer's Sentiments of this Matter," i. e. (if it be to the Purpose) of *Tosorthrus's* Invention of building with *Square Stones*. "Homer supposes the Science of Architecture arrived to great Perfection in the Time of the *Trojan War*. For speaking of the Palace of *Paris* (whom as his great Translator rightly observes, he makes to be a *Bel Esprit, and a fine Genius*) he describes it in this Manner.

"Εκλαρδε περὶ δώματος Ἀλεξανδρεῖοι βεβίκει
ΚΑΛΑ, τάχ' ἀυτὸς ἔτενε σὺν ἀνδρεσιν, οἱ τοτε" Αεισε
"Ησαν ἐνὶ Τεγέῃ ἐπιβάλλει τέκλοντες ἄνδρες
"Οι ὧν ἐποίησεν Φέλαμον καὶ Δῶμα καὶ ἀντην.

Il. Z. 312.

"Here we see a magnificent Palace, built by profest Architects with all its Suits of Apartments. As different from the Description of *Hector's Habitation*, as were the Characters of the Masters: Of which last he only says it was a commodious, habitable House.

"Αἴτα δὲ ἔπειδικαν δόμος εὐ ναιετάντας
Εὐλογεῖς. ——————

ibid. 497.

Is

Is it not a Matter of some Wonder, that Mr. Warburton should quote this Passage of *Homer*, as something opposed to Sir Isaac, when there is not one Word about the *Materials* with which this “magnificent Palace” was built? Or could not “magnificent Palaces” be built, without building them of *Square Stone*? Or was not *Paris* at least a hundred Years after the Times of *Sesostris*? And was not *Paris* in *Egypt*, from whence He might learn the Art of building with *Stone*? After all that *Homer* here says, it is no more, than that *Paris* had a *House*, and *Bed-chamber*, and *Porch* to it; and that the best Builders in *Troy* built it. But whether it was built of *Wood*, or *Brick*, or *Flints*, or what Materials, there is not One Syllable; and *Homer's* Language would encline one to think, that this *Bel-Esprit* was not above working in the Building itself. Nor in short is there any Thing in the Original, like a *magnificent Palace* here described. Indeed if one were to look no further than Mr. Pope's Translation, one could not well form too great an Idea of it.

*Hector to Paris, lofty Dome repairs
 Himself the Mansion rais'd, from every Part
 Assembling Architects of matchless Art.
 Near Priam's Court, and Hector's Palace stands
 The Pompous Structure, and the Town commands.*

Iliad. 6. l. 389,—393.

But the Simplicity of Homer's Language conveys to us not any Thing of Grandeur and Magnificence, nor his *Assembling Architects from all Parts.*

But a real, magnificent Palace, and something to the Purpose, is not taken Notice of by Mr. Warburton; I mean That of Old King *Priamus*: In which

Πενήκοντ' ἔνεσαν Σάλαμος Ξεστοῖο λίθοιο
 Πλήσιοι ἀλλήλων δεδμήμενοι.—

Iliad. ζ. 244.

were Fifty Chambers all of Polished Stone;

Κεράννη δ' ἐτέρανθεν ἔνευσις ἐνδοθεν αὐλῆς
 Δώδεκας ἔσται τέγεοι Σάλαμος Ξεστοῖο λίθοιο
 Πλήσιοι ἀλλήλων δεδμήμενοι· ἐνθάδε γαμβεῖται
 Κοιμᾶντο.—

ibid.

On the other Side within the Porch there were twelve Chambers of polish'd Stone built near one another, for his Sons in Law, and their

their Wives. Mr. Pope has translated these five Lines of *Homer* in a beautiful Manner.

And now to *Priam's stately Courts* he came,
Raifed on arch'd Columns of stupendous Frame ;
O'er these a Range of Marble Structure runs,
The rich Pavillions of his fifty Sons,
In fifty Chambers lodged ; and Rooms of State
Oppos'd to these, where *Priam's Daughters* fate :
Twelve Domes for them, and their loved Spouses shone,
Of equal Beauty, and of polifh'd Stone.

Iliad. 6. l. 304, &c.

But how fine soever this Description of *Priam's Palace* may be, it must be owned, that it gives us the Idea of a much more magnificent Building, than *Homer's* own Words do. *Homer* tells us nothing of *Rooms of State*, or of *Columns of stupendous Frame*, or of *Ranges of Marble Structure*. But supposing all these to have been in *Priam's Palace*,--- What will this prove against Sir Isaac Newton, who has told us only, that *Tosorthrus* had found out the Art of Building with *Stone* in *Egypt*, not in *Troy* or in *Asia Minor*, where it might have been in Practice long before his Time. Let *Africanus* and *Eusebius* answer for the Fact.

Sir

Sir Isaac depends on their Authority: Of supposing that *Africanus*'s Words are to be extended so far as to imply, that *Tosorthus* was absolutely the first, who, τὴν Σιδ
ξεσῶν λίθων ὀικοδομὴν ἔνεγκλο, found out building with Square Stones, Syncel. p. 54. --- This may be true, for aught that *Homer* here has said; for Old *Priam* did not live till near a hundred Years after *Tosorthrus*, and his Invention.

It might have been as much or more to the Purpose to have mentioned *Solomon's Temple*, and the hew'd or Square Stones made use of in That. The Times would here have suited: But that which seems to shew, that cutting, and building with Stone, was then a *new* Invention, may be gathered from the Number of Hands employ'd in that Work. No fewer than *seventy thousand* were employ'd in carrying them, and *eighty thousand* in cutting them in the Mountains; besides *three thousand three hundred*, which *rul'd the People that wrought in the Work*. Too many Hands, had there been any great Skill or Art in such Sort of Work! But then This Building

Building was not in Egypt, and consequently no Objection to the Time of *Tosorthus's* Invention in Egypt.

I have here sent you a few of the Remarks, which I made in perusing this Treatise of Mr. Warburton. It is certainly the Work of a Man of Learning and Abilities: However inconclusive his Reasoning is. You will ask me perhaps, Why I have not vindicated myself in Particular against his Attacks? But what relates to me in his *Postscript* is sufficiently replied to in these Papers: As to what concerns me in the Body of his Book, where he treats of the double Sense of Prophecies,---It wants no Answer to shew, that Allegories, or Allegorical Representations, were never by me denied.--- And as to his Manner of introducing Personal Reflections, --- it cannot be worth while to take Notice of them. I had used the Particle *Then*, as an *illative Particle*: *We have Then but one literal Sense of any Prophecy.*---His Answer is, --- " *THEN? WHEN? Why,* " *when all the Rules of Logic are reduced to this Author's Standard.*" As if, *Then*, in the Place I used it, were a Particle of *Time.*

Time. Let him glory in such Triumphs unmolested. I shall conclude this Letter, with an Observation of Mr. Warburton, "That Systems, Schemes, and Hypotheses, all bred of Heat in the warm Region of Controversy," give me leave to add, or of a wild Imagination, "will, like Meteors in a troubled Sky, each have its Turn to *blaze and pass away.*" Do you judge, whether this Remark be most applicable to Sir Isaac Newton's Chronology, or to Mr. Warburton's *Demonstration of the Divine Legation of Moses from the Omission of a future State of Rewards and Punishments in the Jewish Dispensation.* I am,

Reverend Sir,

Your &c.

Feb. 24, 1743-4.

A. A. SYKES,

F I N I S,

